

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. V

DECEMBER, 1904

NO. 6

Socialism and Human Nature; Do They Conflict

THE INDIVIDUAL CONSCIOUSNESS.

SOcialism with its program of social transformation by revolution and its doctrine of the maintenance of a society based on social instead of individual activity, has always appealed to the individualist as being contrary to the nature of things and eminently impracticable. Approach the average man with such a program and philosophy and instinctively the first words that will roll from his mouth are, "It is contrary to human nature; it is impracticable." This is said with a spirit of finality discouraging to the evangelist of the new creed.

This well nigh universal attitude of mind presents a most interesting study and an analysis of its properties and their significance would prove very useful to the socialist propaganda.

Such a study reveals that the attitude of the individualist is not a mere hearsay handed down from the powers that be as a rebuff against the threat of socialism, and perpetuated as an heirloom among the uninformed, but that it is one of the several forms of consciousness the involving mind assumes in the presence of the evolving universe. The individual existed prior to society, and individualism persists long after society and social facts come into existence, by virtue of a vigorous infidelity.

The individual consciousness persists in drawing conclusions from a pre-social world, in the midst of the evolving social life, having failed as yet to awaken to the social fact and the social relation. To the individualist all life is embraced in the individual life, which is creative and casual and is the source of all social conditions, civilizations, systems, governments and institutions.

POSITION OF THE INDIVIDUALIST.

To illustrate the irreconcilable nature of individualism and socialism, we will let the individualist state his position on the question, "The individual is the creative cause of social conditions,

governments, institutions and social changes; the thing created cannot be superior to its creator; governments and institutions can never be better than men, they can only slowly conform to the growth and perfecting of individuals; we will never have perfect institutions until we have perfect men; systems follow, they do not go in advance of men; socialism is impossible because it proposes to perfect men by first perfecting governments and institutions whereas it should seek to perfect governments and institutions by first perfecting men; even if the socialists were to succeed in establishing a perfect system, men as we find them today, would soon mutilate it and drag it down to their level, and would in the end conform it to their natures, as now all institutions conform to contemporaneous man; the system proposed by the socialists presupposes the extinction of selfishness, the dominance of altruism, an overmastering sense of duty, a spirit of concession and self-sacrifice, a surrender of self to others, without which qualities the system would go to pieces in a short time; such qualities can be cultivated in the race only by thousands of years of labor with individuals, and when men reach that perfection, socialism, or at any rate, the perfect system will have already come; socialism rests for its perpetuity on the assumption that men will become so infatuated with the security and joy and peace brought on by the reign of equity and love, that they will voluntarily abandon self-seeking selfishness, cease all scheming for personal aggrandizement, and yield wholly to the welfare of the commonwealth; acquaintance with human nature on the contrary reveals that the dominant passion of all activity is personal self-seeking, that this passion has the force and the persistence of a primordial instinct, that it is the primal source of activity, that it always has and always will, under all conditions, manifest itself, and that the Utopian who fails to include it in his calculations builds upon sand."

A BATTLE OF INDIVIDUALISTS.

When the individual presents this array of arguments to the adherent of the socialist movement who is still an individualist he makes short work of the latter. The socialist who is a socialist in response to a religious prompting for equity and love, but who is still an individualist in mind, falls an easy prey to the individualist reasoning and is dumbfounded and vanquished because he finds himself arrayed against himself; but the fact that he persists in following that which he cannot reconcile with logic is the latest re-vindication of the world-old phenomena—the religious devotee and is one illustration of the vitality of socialism as a religion.

Hence the outer works of socialism are often taken by the individualist foe, and the border warfare presents a chaos of reciprocal rout and confusion and mutual reprisal, but within the

inner defenses, socialism evolved to social consciousness, occupies an impregnable fortress, against which the battling hosts of individualism are sundered and shivered, and which, secure from any danger of capture, is harboring its resources to dominate the world of consciousness.

THE TWO WORLDS OF CONSCIOUSNESS.

This great thought struggle between the individualist and the socialist has a vital significance. It is no less than a struggle of a latter with a more primitive mode of consciousness, and marks an historic metamorphosis in the evolution of intelligence. The emergence of thought from the primal individualist consciousness into social consciousness or the awakening of man from social unconsciousness to the perception of the casual relation of society to the individual, involves a radical transference of the basis of thought—a transference from the consideration of the individual as the unit of life to the consideration of society as the unit and cause of life—a change so thorough that the opposing camps cannot understand each other, and this is why that to the individualist the socialist is a crack brained enthusiast and visionary who expects to transform the world and change men's natures in a day, contrary to all facts; and this is why that to the socialist the individualist is a blind and stubborn reactionary incapable of reading the facts of history or the broad manifestations of development.

THE TWO MODES OF ACTIVITY.

These opposite conceptions of life which go to the bottom of all problems of life and determine all processes of thought have also a paramount practical importance; they are the starting point of all methods of procedure to stamp out vice, abolish social evils, elevate submerged populations and effect the emancipation and the moral regeneration of the race and the individual.

The individualist seeing the individual as the creator and cause of all human institutions and conditions, traces all evils to inherent and unavoidable defects in human nature, and seeks to eliminate these evils by appealing to and reforming the man. The socialist who sees that systems, civilizations and societies set the limitations, fix the conceptions and determine the activities of men and make them what they are, strikes at the evils and imperfections outcropping in men's natures by striking at the defects in systems, civilizations and societies and removing the real cause of the evil. *The socialist is the modern alchemist who handles the moral reagents of the universe as tangible quantities that can be perceived and dealt with at will: he has found the cause of man and slowly he is leading the race up the steep slopes of achievement to the glories and wonders of a new found creatorship.*

REFORM AND REVOLUTION.

Socialism rests on the presumption that normal conditions will produce normal beings; that whatever of bad is found in men comes from causes outside of men in the conditions that surround and make them; hence the Socialist's quarrel is not with human nature, but with social conditions: individualism rests upon the presumption that whatever of bad is found in man comes from the inherent badness in human nature, and is reflected in unjust social conditions; hence the quarrel of individualist is not with social conditions, but with human nature. *Socialism, in aiming at civilizations, systems and social conditions, is essential revolution; individualism, in confining its aims to the improvement of individuals, is essential reform.*

OPTIMISM AND DESPAIR.

Socialism is the doctrine of optimism; it holds out the inspiring hope that through revolution any living generation of men may realize its emancipation, by cutting loose from the conditions from which it suffers. Individualism of necessity denies to contemporaneous generations of men all hope to see any changes or transformations of so radical a nature; in other words, it denies to every man all hope of emancipation. It has always been the doctrine which has denied the entire wholesomeness of human nature, and upon this infidelity it has unfurled the flag of despair.

The individualist is the victim of two fundamental misconceptions. This fixed and causal quantity he has conjured up in his imagination and termed "human nature," which is supposed to possess the same properties under all conditions, and to have the power to conform conditions to itself, exists nowhere and has never had a place in history. The real human nature manifested in history has always been an effect and a conformity to conditions and not a cause and conforming force, and it has manifested itself in as many types as there have been social systems.

The insipid and colorless Altruism, the millenniums and Nirvanas of human brotherhood, of selfless and bloodless commonwealths, where peace is maintained by surrendering individuality, where equity is a gift from the capable to the weak, where justice is charity and all is lovely because the population is made up of a stainless and selfless lot of holy nonentities, such dreams are the revulsions and nothing more of the individualist mind from the horrors of a system where all the opposites are too apparent, just as "heaven" expresses a reaction of the sinner's mind. It is a significant fact that the individualist's, or his modern representative the capitalist's, "socialism," resembles in

almost every detail the sinner's heaven, "where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest."

No such a dream or Utopia has place in the constructive program proposed by socialists. Socialism is a revindication of the healthy old philosophy that might is right, and that equity is another name for contending powers that have reached a balance. Every achievement was won by force. Every victory is a revindication of the fact that one force happened to be stronger than another. Force is the one thing in the universe that is effective. Every right and privilege is held and every status maintained by an equilibrium of battling forces. *Socialism is an absolute committal to the logic of force.*

The origin of force in society is the instinct to preserve one's self against all hostile forces, and the instinct to enhance or aggrandize one's self or secure the rivalry for life. The ultimate force in society is a triumphant combination of the majority of individuals who have been disinherited and dislodged from every point of advantage and security by the triumphant employment of these instincts by the minority. This disinheriting process, which exists in the nature of things, and is now observed to be going on at an unprecedented rate, in the growth of the trusts, the centralization of wealth and the absorption of the public domain by the few, inevitably leads to the predestined historic combination which will capture and dispossess the conquerors of the world. *Socialism is a recognition that combination is the inevitable and conquering form of force.*

This combination of the many against the few will be for the purpose of the self-preservation and the self-aggrandizement of the individual members of the combine, who will comprehend in the concentrated and perfected machinery of production and distribution a short cut to affluence and freedom from drudgery and the feeling of personal security which the instinct of self-preservation demands.

After the world has been captured by the mass, and the few have been absorbed by the many, a disintegration of the combine and a division and redistribution of the spoils will be impossible for these reasons:—

1st. For the first time in the history of the world claimants for division will be too numerous to make division practicable, and,

2nd. For the first time in the history of the world the spoils of conquest will have become indivisible; for the perfecting of machinery and the integration of the productive processes will have made such division destructive, even were it possible.

Robbers may divide jewelry or coin, but conquering democracies cannot divide railroad systems or the inter-linked industries of the great trusts.

After the conquest, the common sense and the common selfishness of each will teach him that it is better to possess an interest in the whole, which will guarantee to him the freedom to employ himself in the gratuitous use of the tools of production, and the power to appropriate the result and hold it out against all others, than to demand a fraction of the whole which would be valueless; and consequently collective or common ownership must of a necessity result.

SELF-INTEREST THE BASIS OF SOCIAL INTEGRITY.

After common ownership has been established, the innate spirit of self-preservation and self-aggrandizement, will rush to the defense of the whole, and will surrender no right it has won in the whole. *The perpetuity of collective ownership will be insured by that selfish and preservative instinct in every man that he will not willingly permit an advantage to another that he cannot claim for himself lest his own interests be undermined thereby.* Under collective ownership this powerful instinct is placed in possession of an effective weapon, the public powers, to enforce this demand, and upon this foundation rests the co-operative commonwealth.

A further elucidation of the principle of social unity as the result of an equilibrium of individual self-centered instincts, may be pardoned.

These two classes of instincts, the one working to preserve self and the other to enhance self, constitute at once the bond and stimuli of the social life.

Self aggrandizement is an anarchistic force forming only into factional combinations for ulterior purposes, which disintegrate when the personal aim is reached: it begins and ends in the life of persons. But it serves a useful purpose in stimulating the dominant instinct of self-preservation to impel men into greater and greater combinations.

Self-preservation is essentially a socialistic force. The moment you threaten the welfare of a certain number of individuals you force them to combine. Combination for self-preservation is the potent fact of history. It is so apparent that in the struggle for existence men have never been able to escape combining for mutual protection, that the case hardly needs arguing. From the tribe to the nation, from the guild to the lodge, from the secret organization of ancient times to the labor union, history has been but a record of combinations for self-preservation.

THE VITAL PRINCIPLE OF THE PUBLIC LIFE.

The latest and most universal expression of the unifying instinct of self-preservation is found in the growing public life and public spirit of modern times. From privatism to publicity is the historic trend in response to the growing power of privatism and

the growing necessity for general self-preservation. The public up to date is a combination of those universal interests outside the private warring interests of individuals; that is, it is the out-working of the desire in every man that he will be protected from the innumerable private interests around him while pursuing his own; that he will be saved from the necessity of descending in the struggle for existence, below the accepted standards of contemporaneous business ethics, to compete with criminals by criminal practices, and that in our highly differentiated society, those persons apart from himself and over whom he has no personal control, who provide things necessary to his social and material wellbeing shall be restrained from working him any great harm or injustice or withholding things needful for his welfare.

ORGANIC HUMANITY.

The coming of the public universal, the elimination of privatism from industry and government, places self-preservation for the first time in history in an impregnable position: all the sources of life will belong to the public, every man will have a vital and direct interest in the universal public possession and to encroach upon this domain is to touch the interests of millions of individuals who have the remedies at hand for recovery and know how to use them.

For the first time in history the spoiler will find that he has worked himself into the dilemma that he cannot plunder anybody without plundering everybody in a most glaringly direct and open manner: hence spoliation will have become impracticable; *in other words the historic victim of spoliation, stimulated to growth and power by the process becomes in the end so huge and powerful and watchful that to plunder him is to invite destruction.*

SOCIAL MATHEMATICS.

The final formula into which society outworks itself, where personal and social interests conflict, is, "all against one:" anarchistic self-seeking through its factional combinations up to the private corporations, or trusts more powerful than governments, following the centering process of selfishness, squeezes out the members of its combinations by a natural process and narrows down at last to its logical formula of one for one, and finds itself arrayed against a universal solidarity, the result of its own pernicious activity. One for one, the finale of personal selfishness, and all for all, the finale of social selfishness express the ultimates of social integration; and one against all expresses the residue of desire which may remain, after the process of social integration will have completed itself, to win every personal advantage possible and to hold every personal advantage possible. But this personal desire, where the weapons of privatism are des-

troyed, will stand alone and unarmed against its perfectly equipped and all powerful opponent, the public.

THE DIVINE CONSTITUTION OF THINGS.

There is something terribly suggestive of an interesting co-incident in the fact that greed is an attenuating process which, disease-like consumes itself, that the victim of spoliation is an avenging Nemesis predestined to devour the despoiler, and that the termination of all purely self-centered activities is in a *cul de sac*. A committal to the doctrine that, "Might is right," is also a committal to the doctrine that, "Right is Might," for the last term of force is morality, and the ultimate form of law is moral law: *for out of the chaos of social forces comes the equilibrium of all forces which is that elemental equity wherein the individual can claim nothing from others which he cannot grant from himself, and need grant nothing to others which he cannot claim for himself.*

Socialism then, is not a gospel of selfless brotherhood, but it is a philosophy which deals with living forces: the co-operative commonwealth will not be maintained by love and duty, but by force—the force of a triumphant and proprietary democracy, in which the irreducible instincts of the proprietor are fully aroused, and the whole flood of the powerful primordial instincts that center around the preservation of self will be poured as life-giving blood into the public life; a force which comprehends that life will depend upon public efficiency and public purity and cannot rest until this condition is enforced. The co-operative commonwealth will not be perpetuated by mutual concession and sacrifice, but it will rest on the economic condition that the process of production and distribution will have reached a stage of indivisibility, that public operation alone is possible; and it will be maintained because the public will be too powerful, too selfish, too watchful to be despoiled with impunity and the individual for the first time in history will stand alone and unequipped to despoil.

SOCIALISM NATURAL AND INDESTRUCTIBLE.

Socialism is another example of the constantly recurring historic fact: the system greater than the individual, and the individual being conformed to the system. Socialism will come because socialism is inherent in the constitution of the race. It will come because the primordial elements of human nature cannot reach any other conclusion. It will come, not through any change in human nature but because human nature is what it is, and it will require no rarer qualities for its establishment than sufficient popular intelligence and popular spirit to comprehend one's own interests.

Socialism has co-existed with the race; it is but the expres-

sion of the growth of society. From the primordial brute world of anarchy to the present time and onward, the vast silent social processes of integration work to the making of man; they alone express the real progress of the race.

PRIMORDIAL ELEMENTS OF HUMAN NATURE.

Now that we have dealt at some length with the current misconception of individualists regarding socialism, let us take a closer view of this "human nature" about which individualists have so much to say.

Every civilization produces its type, every social condition its quality of "Human nature." This is a broad historic manifestation which leads to conclusions radically at variance with individualism and yet broadly and through all history and peoples run certain qualities common to all men we may denominate "human nature," but these qualities possess a certain plasticity and receptivity that annuls the conclusions of individualists.

The two recognizable properties of "human nature" that persevere from the lowest to the highest development and under all conditions are,

1st. That men will struggle to the utmost under any given condition to live, and,

2nd. That man will conform his nature to any condition that is not absolutely destructive, in order to live.

The instinct to struggle for existence, and the capacity to exist by adaptation are the universally observed characteristics of human and animal life, but much greater capacity for adaptation is required in man than in the animal, for in addition to climateric and fauna and floral changes to which animals must conform men must periodically re-create themselves in order to conform to vast and radical social transformations, or they must perish.

The history of society is a history of successive social metamorphoses, and the history of the individual is the history of a succession of individual adaptations enforced by these metamorphoses.

ADAPTATION THE LAW OF LIFE.

The Eskimo with his furs and blubber, the African with his tribal life, the slave with his submissiveness and the criminal of the slum districts with his cunning are adaptations to conditions. Let the Eskimo abandon his furs and blubber, the African his tribe, the slave his submissiveness, the criminal his cunning and destruction will result. Our complex civilization is honey-combed with classes and communities of men that can be readily distinguished by certain manners, apparel, habits, physiognomy, speech, and above all by clearly marked mental and moral characteristics and certain habitual modes of thought and views. These

are products of conditions any one can study in the midst of our twentieth century civilization, and can definitely trace each kind of human product back to his social cause and clearly understand why he is what he is. It is well for the race that human nature can adapt itself and become good or bad, servile or lordly as the condition demands, and, most wonderful of all, will suffer evils far worse than death in order to live; else we would not be here.

THE MAKING OF MEN.

The sweeping social transformations that have marked man's emergence from the primordial brute world, have been characterized by a procession of distinct types of individuals following in the wake of conditions and events. So vital have been the social transformations that they have fixed the views, conceptions, motives of action, traits, habits and to a large extent the physiognomy of the successive types of individuals.

In the brute world, transformations come through age-long geologic processes—the subsidence of continents, the emergence of mountain chains, the changing of ocean and air currents—but in the social world man occupies a sphere of his own whose movements do not depend upon the tardy oscillations of the earth's crust. *Here too, life is the product of condition, but condition is the residue of antecedent life. In our ascent to the moral universe we occupy a half-divine world, and are at once creature and creator.* The products of men's brains lashed into unrelenting activity in the merciless struggle for existence, fix themselves into new conditions; the foundations of society are shaken, institutions and social relations are changed, and man is re-created. The inventors and discoverers, are the unconscious gods of the underworld who literally make and unmake men. The innocent inventor of gunpowder or of the steam engine would be appalled at the types of men they have destroyed and replaced.

THE HISTORIC PROCESSION OF TYPES.

The four dominant types of men whose destiny is to make history are, the tribal type, the military type, the commercial type and the coming type,—the civic type or social type. Add to these the subject types, which began with the slave and end with the wage-worker, and to these the types of retainers who have hung, through all history, close to the master types, and add further the types of the submerged or criminal classes and you may form a picture of the historic procession of types.

In each case the production of a new type is caused by a series of economic developments that change the foundations of society, call for a readjustment of social relations, and re-create the individual.

Increased destructiveness produced the first two dominant types—the warrior and the soldier: increased productiveness, produced the last, the capitalist, and will compel the production of the next, the civic or social type.

THE WARRIOR.

The development of the bow and arrow among the inhabitants of the primeval forest world placed man in an entirely new relation to the terrible beasts around him and to his still more terrible fellow men. The little family group which had been sufficient to protect him against animals no longer sufficed to protect him against the increased destructiveness of man and he was driven into those evergrowing combinations, the tribes—the first social groupings of man, and the nebulae of the moral universe. In the tribe he was changed from a solitary to a communistic creature whose life was of less importance to himself than to the life of the tribe, and whose undying devotion to the tribe and to the tribal honor made him a stoic under the insufferable tortures inflicted by his captors. In the forest he was changed from a victim to a beast of prey which called for a complete re-adjustment of all his instincts and habits—a complete transformation of the man. Never in the history of the world has there been such a perfect development of the sense, such an eye, such an ear, such an instinct for pursuit and retreat, such cunning, such skill in reading the movements and dangers of human and animal foe and prey, such a close touch of sense to the insensate, as there was in the new king of the forest with his bow and arrow.

THE SOLDIER.

The great fact which brought about the conditions that produced the soldier, who from the lordly aristocrat to the private in the ranks dominated the world for several thousand years, is the increased destructiveness of men resulting from the development of metallic offensive and defensive weapons which drove men into those vast aggregations known as nations which insured an armed peace within certain borders and allowed a chance for production and propagation. A series of industrial developments abetted the growth of the military nation and made possible the evolution of the fortified city from the camp. The evolution of slavery, a necessary process for the good of man specialized the soldier's occupation into getting a living solely by the exercise of military prowess.

Here then we have the conditions that re-created dominant man into the soldier type: the forest and the keen life of the animal-man are forced into the background, the traits which had utility in the forest and meant success, no longer have utility and mean destruction in the camp and the walled city. The whole

range of men's senses have deteriorated: the keenness of eye, the sharpness of ear, the cunning of instinct no longer have utility, and the physical man has been transformed. A moral transformation has taken place. Large masses of men must move together in the new business of life, mass-murder, and discipline and subordination, qualities impossible to the savage, have utility and mean success. A vast slave population must be kept in subjection and the domineering character is developed. A radically different being is the creature of the camp from the creature of the forest, but a stranger being still is the creature of the soldier—the slave. Denied the right to adapt himself to any natural environment he adapts himself solely to the wants of his master, eliminating and suppressing for his own safety all the traits of the normal man and cultivating the negative of all healthy characteristics. The slave represents an extreme of adaptation, and the readiness with which a free man can conform his nature, for his personal safety, to the demands of slavery, and transmit his subservient and simulating disposition to posterity, illustrates with what rapidity human nature can be conformed to conditions, where sufficient force is applied.

THE CAPITALIST.

As arms and armor, an inevitable development from savage life, laid the foundation of the military nation and made the soldier; so machinery, a later development, transferred the foundations of social power into new hands and produced the present dominant type, the capitalist. The forest is lost, the camp pushed into the back-ground and the factory and the mart occupy the center of the world's stage. The creature of the forest is forgotten, the creature of the camp is crowded into a secondary place and the creature of the factory and the mart steps into the mastery of the world, a new creation, dominated by motives, conceptions, views, habits, methods of procedure, activities and traits different from his predecessors, and above all with a new weapon of commercial exploitation or finance backed by the armies and navies of the world.

The commercial type is as perfect an adaptation to surroundings as was the savage type in the midst of the native forest. The acquisition and retention of wealth and the maintenance of his position in the midst of hostile forces utilizes a new set of energies. Craft, simulation, calculation, persistent aggressiveness, diplomacy, highly developed acquisitive qualities, readiness to take advantage, coldness, indifference and a disregard for others, are the qualities that insure commercial success and that characterize the commercial type. In the commercial type is restored much of that keenness, cunning, resourcefulness, and initiative of the savage, qualities which are always developed when the individual stands comparatively alone against hostile forces.

THE UTILIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF TRAITS.

The production of the foregoing dominant types brings out clearly one fact: given social systems have utility for certain personal energies and they use them to the suppression or elimination of all other traits. You have but to know what personal qualities a system or civilization has use for and you may predict its type of individuals. *The strong and successful man of history has always been the man who has adapted himself most completely to the system and the failure has been he who has been unable to so adapt himself. The successful man has not been the good man, in the past, and at present, but he has been the man whom the system has utilized most in conformity with itself.* The savage possessed few traits for which the military system had utility and the knight errant would be a conspicuous failure in the stock exchange.

THE SOCIAL TYPE.

All the foregoing has been said concerning types that it may be understood upon what basis we may predicate what qualities of character will be utilized and what type of man will be produced in the co-operative commonwealth.

What was said prior concerning the inevitability, the overwhelming solidarity and power, and the indestructibility of the social commonwealth, was said for the purpose of fixing the fact in the mind that socialism is not a scheme concocted in the mind of any one, to be attempted and laid aside at will, but a huge insurmountable condition that, whether desirable or not, is coming to take possession of us, and re-create us as systems have done in the past. With the idea firmly fixed in our mind that whatever we may say or do cannot change the enduring fact of socialism, even in its initiatory stages, we are ready to consider what the man will be when adapted to the demands of the proprietary democracy.

The term, social type, is used to bring out the idea that under socialism, the successful man, the dominant type of individual, will be the man in whom, organic society, the property holding democracy, can find the most utility.

What are the conditions under which man finds himself in the co-operative commonwealth?

1st. He finds himself face to face with an all powerful public in possession of the sources of wealth and life—a public which cannot be bribed, tricked or forced.

2nd. He finds he cannot apply himself directly to the means of production nor provide for himself without serving the public and conforming to public regulation, and receiving for his efforts whatever the public has agreed upon.

3d. He finds that he is no longer able to move men and things as formerly, directly by the arbitrary application of his will, but

that he has to bring about things that seem desirable or proper by a new and much slower process, moral suasion, and the application of intelligence.

4th. He finds himself an integral part of the public and discovers that he has a right everywhere and in everything.

THE INDIVIDUALIZING OF THE PUBLIC.

Here then is the situation: the safety of the individual is threatened by this great new power in peaceful possession of the sources of life. How will he wrest from this new power life, freedom, and the joy of life, and cleave out a path for himself as he did in the forest, in the camp and in the centers of commercial civilization? The powerful desires, and terrible fears that rally to the preservation of the individual are as strong and virile as in primeval man, and must find an outlet. The instinct to hew out a path of freedom for himself and live the life of his own, a fundamental instinct which at once proclaims the integrity and the intrinsic worth of the individual allies itself with primordial man and rushes to meet the new power. What will be the grand resultant; what the re-created man?

From the nature of man and his desires, and from the constitution of the public comes this saving fact: *The individual in the co-operative commonwealth is an integral part of the whole public, and such a public has nothing in its constitution except such individual integers.* The public whose integers are classes and private warring factions, is the public which rests on special privileges, it is the tool of the most powerful interest. The power it wields is alien to the constituency and is at the same time malevolent and oppressive. Strip down the public to its individual basis, let its component parts be individuals, for all else is alien, uproot and destroy privatism which diverts and dissipates streams of energy the public should claim, and you have destroyed every oppressive and malevolent feature of public life. In the very nature of things, such a public cannot do otherwise than reflect all the desires of the individual which do not militate against the freedom, happiness and safety of other individuals. Such a public cannot impose onerous regulations, oppressive measures, or unreasonable exactions, because such things are by nature impositions and have always come from without from power holding or alien bodies who were benefited by such tyrannies to the injury of the victims. As well expect an individual without reason or motive to break the first law of life and inflict tortures upon himself as to expect a collectivity to impose upon itself anything undesirable. The insuperable barrier in this case is the fact that any undesirable regulation arising from within a collectivity would have to win the assent of the majority and the majority would be the first to suffer from it. *Undesirable laws always come from*

minorities, and then only when such minorities comprehend that they can evade them. The only assurance there is that no undesirable public regulation will be enacted is a condition wherein majority rule is the natural and logical result of circumstance, as under socialism. Perhaps the only law in the universe which has no exception is this, that the individual will not do a thing undesirable to himself unless for a reason which makes it desirable. Desirability is the basis of all activity and upon this rock rests the guarantee of freedom in public life.

Mistrust of the public is essential anarchy and original infidelity; it strikes at the heart of humanity and undermines the constitution of the race; it is the profoundest and most universal error socialism is called upon to combat.

We have observed before that the public is the expression in society of the spirit of self-preservation: this at once expresses the meaning and scope of the public and fixes its limitations. *Public self-preservation will alone restrain man in the future: class self-preservation oppresses and limits him now.* In those activities only, that militate against the spirit of self-preservation does the individual feel the hand of the public, and then he feels but the just repression of the united hands of other individuals protecting themselves.

In the moral universe of right doing the man and the public part company. Here, only, is the masterless world, where the sovereign lord of the domain appropriates the products of his own creation and lives an unfearing life of freedom and endeavor.

THE SOCIALIZATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

The trick of history is to so condition the individual that he cannot arrive at himself without traveling the social road. The passage to himself through the social route purifies and regenerates the man; tames and civilizes the wild primitive instincts, rationalizes the mind, intensifies the moral and intellectual being, develops the civic virtues of public spirit, responsibility, deliberation and equipoise, and the social elements of benevolence and love. History turns the trick when she evolves the monster proprietor public and places him in possession of everything.

Here is the individual, face to face with the new big power. To say that he will in some way wrest a living from it and do the best thing possible for himself is but to repeat an historic fact. But cunning, which stood the warrior in such good stead, and brute courage and force, which saved the soldier, and manipulation, which was the salvation of the capitalist, have lost their efficacy, before this new power, and it behooves the individual to bring forth from his infinite energies, new weapons, a new mode of struggling, and new efficacious historic force.

The bow and arrow, the sword and battering ram, and that

weapon of the capitalist the deed and the property law, thinly veiling the bayonet and the cannon, all have become antiquated weapons of past struggles, and the new man faces the new power armed only with his naked abilities and his vote. *History has disarmed the man in the final struggle, of all destructive weapons, equipped him constructively, and pitted him against the most powerful of all forces, compelling him in the last grapples to win his way on his unassisted intellectual and moral merits, thereby lifting him clear out of the material into the moral universe.*

With the possibility of employing only the moral and intellectual powers to win what we merit and hold what we get, in the democratic bodies and assemblages of the future; with only this alternative, comes the civic virtues, and the moral and intellectual intensification of man.

But moral suasion, the new power by which men alone can do, and move things outside themselves, represents but the one side of the individual development: it represents man as the constituency and basis of the democracy; man the master influencing the democracy to his liking. But there is another side of the individual's development—the side expressed by the democracy's preference for the man; the side expressed by the utility of the man for the democracy—the new efficacious historic force to save the man in the presence of the new conditions.

The new force to save the individual will be public efficiency. The big proprietor public can save itself only by utilizing this force of personal character, and the first centuries of the co-operative commonwealth will be marked by an elimination and decadence of those traits which now make men successful and the development of all the traits which constitute public efficiency. Following the simple and universal law of self interest, the constituent democracy with the unerring accuracy of natural law will reward its representatives according in degree to the measure and excellency of their service. Its sensitive and powerful instincts of self-preservation can be depended upon in the long run to bring this about.

Given a proprietor democracy, and a free world upon which to expend its energies, and inevitably, and in the long run, the society learns this wholesome truth: That its greatest possible advantage lies in rewarding its faithful, and according to faithfulness; and inevitably, and in the long run, the individual learns that his greatest possible advantage lies in being absolutely faithful to society. These correlated truths are the bedrock of socialism, or social integrity.

For the first time in the history of the world the eminently sane, moral and benevolent traits of service for the common good will be cashable at their face value and men will go at their social worth. Under such conditions men will cultivate these traits, not

for their intrinsic moral value, as the preacher would have them do, but because they mean life, success, appreciation and love of fellows, material well-being, moral opportunity, emoluments, honor, affluence, joy; and their absence will mean failure, disgrace, suffering. For the first time in the world's history the successful man will be the best man, and the serviceable man will be the man of power.

Society turns the trick on the individual and socializes him, when it cuts off his personal connection with the sources of life, and having equipped him with only the ballot and the civic virtues compels him to travel the social road to find and provide for himself.

MORAL COMPETITION.

Under the conditions just described, there can be no doubt but that there will exist between individuals the most active and universal competition for success the world has ever witnessed. *In a world where only naked merit counts the rise to eminent appreciation impelled by one of the strongest instincts in human nature will be the business of life.* This competition will be unlike any form of competition that has hitherto existed in history—it will be the pitting of purely moral qualities, the matching of worth against worth before the social being which judges and appreciates and selects the best material with the certainty of natural law.

History seems to reveal ascending stages of competition: development seems to lead from military competition to commercial and from commercial to moral competition; from a rivalry which determines who is physically strongest to a rivalry which determines who is mentally strongest, and from a rivalry which determines who is mentally strongest to a rivalry which determines who is morally strongest. All the old forms of competition destroy themselves by engendering combination, but it would hardly seem that this is possible in the matching of worth with worth.

THE RELIGION OF LOVE.

Into what forms and intensifications of moral life this new competition will lead, from that service in the commonwealth, which is simulation, clear up to that service which is religion and which sanctifies every deed done for the common weal, can only be conjectured, but we may catch a gleam from history's pages, that reveals the transcendent capacities of man in this direction by contemplating religions and religious martyrs.

THE SAVING GRACE OF SOCIALISM.

Not in that rigidly mathematical philosophy, which under the name of socialism, promises to abolish poverty by measuring out service in hours and minutes, and rewards service with exact

time values, thereby effecting communistic equality of wealth, lies the saving grace of socialism, but in the fact that in the change to the social life, the rewards of individual efforts no longer flow from personal qualities which center all life into self and measure all values by standards of personal advantage, but because such rewards will flow from a collective and impersonal being, society, which true to a selfish instinct and with the unerring accuracy of natural law, will select the best and eliminate the unfaithful and reward according to that goodness which gives the most freely of self to the social being.

The saving grace of socialism lies in the substitution, as a natural law, of the law of social selection, in which the best survive in place of the law of commercial and military selection, wherein the strongest survive. It is in the fact that it reveals the universe to be moral in constitution and that the purport and intent of evolution is goodness and love.

GOD IN THE MAKING.

Men are made by divine circumstances fixed into economic fact and condition by the forces in and around them. The universe is fundamentally moral and democratic. The perfect democratic constituency is the foundation of the moral universe and lifts man clear out of the material universe into a world where he touches and handles only moral forces and moral values. Toward this condition all life presses. God struggles up into multiplex consciousness, and the trend of the universe is from the single arbitrary will to the multiplex will, which is its own restraint and counterpoise, its own intensification and perfection.

God is in the making, and the will of man, freed out of the elemental reactions of the universe divine, is turning to the making of God.

CONCLUSIONS.

We have observed that the individualist assumption that "socialism is contrary to human nature and is therefore impossible" rests upon an unhistoric conception of human nature and a misunderstanding of socialism. Perhaps if we could convince the individualist that we, being socialists, have a right to say what socialism is, we could force him to a different conclusion, but such a hope is vain. The best that an individualist mind can do is to picture socialism as a perfected individualism where an altruism which is liable to be destroyed at any time by the selfish instincts of men is the only force which holds men together. The consciousness that we are members and not entireties, that our lives, our thoughts, our modes and motives of activity proceed, not from ourselves, but from the social organism, which good or bad abnormal or wholesome, effects us in a like manner, and the consciousness that emancipation and regeneration are social

processes to be attained by social reconstruction, which is essentially the most potent religious conception the world has evolved, and heralds the emergence of man into a higher plain of being—all these elements of social consciousness, are beyond the grasp of the primitive individualist intellect.

But there is hope in the fact that individualism is not a perversity or error of intellect so much as it is a negative, an unconsciousness. A better name for individualism is social unconsciousness. All that is necessary, is to get on the blind side of man and stimulate it into seeing.

The latter centuries of our civilization have evolved wonderfully effective instruments to accomplish this result. Evolution, the most potent thought force of the last century, has revealed above all things, racial integrity, the organic nature of life, and the inconsequence of the individual, it has even stepped beyond socialism in this regard and socialism is the one force which will restore the individual back toward the position from which science has dislodged him. The evolutionary conception of the race-life has penetrated into every department of science, has taken the world of thought by storm and is forcing individualism out of sociology and economics. The agglomerating forces of today, the centralizing processes which are forcing men into mass-activity, and are rendering the isolated individual more and more insufficient, all are leading up to the time when man awakes from the infidelity, the anarchy, and the despair of individualism.

MURRAY E. KING.

Lessons From the Socialist Vote

ALTHOUGH complete returns are not yet obtainable for all the States in the Union, yet sufficient data exists which enable us to give a very close estimate of the vote. Certain general conclusions may be drawn from the facts. In the first place the growth was greatest at this election and has been most regular in the past in those states having a strong party organization, instance, New York, Illinois and Wisconsin. This is also a partial answer to the statement which will be further considered that the socialist vote this year was "protest vote."

Secondly, the socialist vote offers a most striking proof of the truth of the economic interpretation of history and especially of that corollary of it to the effect that the socialist vote is a direct outgrowth of capitalism and develops most rapidly in those localities where capitalism itself reaches its highest point of evolution. For several years the real industrial center of America has been in the Middle West with Chicago at the apex of its development and with one or two Chicago industries at the very tip. What can be more natural then, than that Chicago should have shown the most rapid increase and that the stock yards should have sent two members to the Legislature. Of course this point does not always work out in this same detail. Some portions of the United States are more backward in their socialism than in their industrial development, and the reverse is also occasionally true.

In the third place, the socialist vote has shown the strongest and most persistent growth in those localities where the membership has been most thoroughly trained in the principles of socialism. This is shown positively in the states instanced above and also by the growth in California and the Pacific states. It is also illustrated with still greater emphasis in the reaction which has taken place in Massachusetts. In my trip last spring through Massachusetts, short as it was, I became convinced that it would be impossible to hold the vote in that state unless something was done in the way of education. There is no use in denying the fact that Massachusetts has been one of the most backward states in the union in the thorough training of its membership in the principles of socialism. If the recent reverses will cause the membership in Massachusetts to set about extending the party organization and developing persons who are thoroughly familiar with socialist philosophy, then, the decrease in votes will have been a positive gain.

New York, by its steady, regular growth teaches this same lesson positively and even more emphatically. Whatever criticisms may be made of the New York movement, and no one has

been freer in making such criticisms than I have, it cannot be denied that it has one of, if not the best, party organizations in the United States and a very large percentage of thoroughly trained students of socialism, while the rank and file of membership are always able to give a reason for the faith that is in them.

Another state from which some of the comrades expected much, only to be disappointed, was Colorado. Those who knew the situation best there, however, knew that the vote should be very small. The men at the head of the Western Federation of Miners who had appealed to the workers of the country for support on the ground that they were socialists, and had received it on that ground; the men who had so proudly boasted of their class consciousness, both on the economic and political field, at the time when the battle was raging all along the line and their efforts were needed by the working men of every state, chose to sneak back into the ranks of the enemy and play the political scab. That they may not be judged without an opportunity to state their own case, I insert herewith a quotation from the *Miners' Magazine* of Nov. 17:

"We have received some criticism because the pages of the Magazine did not blaze with editorial appeals to the laboring men and women, to rally to the support of the Socialist party of the state of Colorado.

It is idle and useless to ask men and women to support the doctrines promulgated by the Socialist party, until they understand thoroughly what Socialism means.

The working class of this country are only becoming acquainted with the alphabet of the industrial problem. They are not yet, as a class, readers in economic science.

It is easy for men in another state to make declarations of bravery who have not borne the brunt of battle.

It is easy for some Socialists to criticise the Magazine while they sit at their firesides surrounded by their wives and children.

But we want these critics to place themselves in the shoes of the deported men of Colorado. We want them to draw upon their imagination and imagine themselves torn from the bosom of their families, prodded with bayonets and incarcerated in bull pens, alive with vermin. We want them to see themselves surrounded by a howling military mob that was purchased and hired by corporate money. We want them to feel the lash of the whip and the blows of the club and gun. We want them to hear the cries of agony that burst from the lips of wives, mothers and sisters. We want them to gaze, if they can, upon the pale faces of children as they were deported in cattle trains to be dumped as outcasts and exiles upon barren deserts without food or shelter, and then ask themselves the question. What would they do in order that they might return to their homes

and feel again the fond and loving embrace of wives and children?

Some men are brave at long range. The world is filled with summer patriots and sunshine warriors. The laboring people of the state of Colorado came to the conclusion that law and constitutional government must be restored, and they saw some immediate and temporary relief in the political extermination of James H. Peabody from the gubernatorial chair of Colorado. The campaign of education has only commenced in Colorado. The battle will go on and the march will be continued until the great mass who are now the slaves of wage bondage will break the shackles of serfdom in the destruction of a system that venerates the dollar and degrades the man."

Unfortunately, the editor has mistaken rhetoric for argument and picturesque denunciation for logic. His sneering reference to the Socialists of other states who are "brave at long range," comes with poor grace from men who deserted in the hour of need. He is so blind to the condition in Colorado that he forgets that the sufferings of the working class in any one of the large cities are many times greater than those which have been endured by the miners of Colorado. The latter's sufferings were more dramatic, but any slum can tell tales of disrupted families, starving children and suffering hosts of workers many times greater than those to be found in Colorado. It was these men, women and children whom the brave warriors of Colorado left to fight the battle alone. And what have they gained in return for their foolish treachery? The press reports now agree that Peabody, by the very simple process of ballot-stealing, will probably retain his position. Even if he does not, the election of Adams means simply a changing of masters. There is one sentence, however, in their statement which casts considerable light upon the whole Colorado situation. They say: "It is idle and useless to ask men and women to support the doctrines promulgated by the Socialist party until they understand thoroughly what Socialism means." Had the officers of the W. F. M. remembered this fact at the time they were prating so loudly of having pledged their union to Socialism, the whole matter would have been much clearer. Indeed, that is the time they were to blame even more than in the recent election. "Resoluting" did not make their members socialists. Neither, from some of the things that their leaders have said, did it apparently confer a liberal education upon the writers of the resolution? This also contains a lesson for some socialists who are attempting to push similar resolutions through the A. F. of L. "But that's another story."

The only other locality which did not quite come up to the expectations was the solid south. However, there was really not much reason for the claims which were put forth for this section.

Its economic backwardness, coupled with the wholesale disfranchisement of the working class, makes it certain that our votes will not be large enough in that locality for many years to come. This, however, does not mean that there should be any relaxation in propaganda work in that locality. On the contrary it is absolutely essential that efforts be made to awake the proletariat of the south. We cannot afford to be handicapped by such a dead weight as that section now represents. The few comrades who are struggling so nobly in the southern states should receive every encouragement and assistance from other portions.

Pennsylvania, while not showing a large increase, has done as well as could be expected in view of the inflated anthracite vote with which comparisons are bound to be made. As far as information can be gained on this subject it seems that the increase is largely in the industrial cities, while it is the anthracite communities in which the decreases have been felt. The west has done exceptionally well. I feel that something of an apology is due to Kansas for the somewhat slighting reference made to her last month. It is evident that there is something doing in Kansas in socialist lines.

It is impossible to comment in detail on the work done in the states of the middle west. Suffice to say that the six states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Ohio, Michigan and Minnesota now contain over one-third of the Socialist votes of the United States. This fact lends encouragement to the proposal of the comrades of that locality to establish a socialist daily in Chicago, a project which now appears certain of realization within a few months.

The table which follows is as accurate as it is possible to make it with the information at hand at the time we went to press. We claim the right to say "I told you so" and to "point with pride" to the estimate which appeared in the October number. To have estimated the total vote within 16,000 and to have made so few important errors in details is, we claim, a tribute to the knowledge possessed by the various comrades throughout the country of the strength of their movement.

SOCIALIST VOTE IN THE UNITED STATES.

Alabama	2,000	Indiana	12,013
Arizona	3,000	Iowa	14,847
Arkansas	1,816	Kansas	15,494
California	29,535	Kentucky	4,000
Colorado	3,918	Louisiana	995
Connecticut	4,543	Maine	1,960
Delaware	146	Maryland	2,179
Florida	2,337	Massachusetts	12,978
Georgia	600	Michigan	10,000
Idaho	4,200	Minnesota	18,000
Illinois	69,325	Mississippi	482

Missouri	13,003	Pennsylvania	21,863
Montana	8,000	Rhode Island.....	800
Nebraska	7,380	South Carolina.....	22
Nevada	700	South Dakota.....	2,000
New Hampshire....	1,090	Tennessee	1,400
New Jersey	9,587	Texas	8,000
New Mexico Ter..	500	Utah	6,000
New York.....	41,000	Vermont	854
North Carolina.....	250	Virginia	500
North Dakota	3,500	Washington	12,000
Ohio	36,123	West Virginia.....	2,000
Oklahoma Territory.	3,500	Wisconsin	28,222
Oregon	11,000	Wyoming	1,200
Total		434,572	

It should in all fairness be noted that nearly every state complains of fraud in the count of Socialist ballots. Specific instances have been proven for Missouri, Colorado and doubtless other states. It is therefore safe to say that the total vote cast for the presidential candidates was close to a half million. On the other hand Comrade Debs ran ahead of his ticket in nearly every state, so that the straight Socialist vote is somewhat less than the number given.

A. M. SIMONS.

The Bohemian Social Democracy

IN the last days of October the Bohemian Social Democracy held its annual congress in Trostějov, one of the industrial centers of Moravia. The secretary of the party submitted to the delegates a report of party activity within the last two years.

The report is an interesting document, especially where it pictures the present chaotic political situation in Austria. The Austrian political balance for the last two years is exceedingly poor. The constant and never abating national strife in Austria fomented by the ruling classes, especially the German bourgeoisie, for their own class interests and in order to divert the attention of the Austrian proletariat from the real issue of the day, that is the labor question, have made impossible the beginning of a new and sound political life in Austria; an empire well deserving to be called "the second sick man of Europe." The last vestige of constitutional rule has disappeared and the remains of constitutional life in this empire of about 20 nationalities have been buried in the grave of paragraph 14 of the Austrian constitution, a paragraph in reality giving the government absolute and unrestricted sway. The situation is well characterized by the Pilsener party organ *Nova Doba*. Without a parliament, and yet according to the law!—without representatives of the people, and yet constitutionally!—that is truly an Austrian curiosity.

Under such circumstances the confidence of the population in the present mode of political life is rapidly disappearing and the masses are beginning to realize that the present intolerable state of affairs must be brought to an end. And this can be achieved only by giving the mass of the Austrian people a voice in the government, by introducing universal and equal suffrage. The Bohemian Social Democracy has over and over again demonstrated for this present cardinal postulate of the Austrian working classes. Especially during sessions of the Austrian parliament (*Reichsrath*) and the different diets (*landtags*) great mass meetings and demonstrations were held. On the seventh day of October, 1904, this led in Brunn, Moravia, to bloodshed. The brutal police attacked a number of our Bohemian comrades and more or less seriously wounded 20 of them.

The Bohemian Social Democrats also continued their struggle for obligatory insurance of old, or injured workingmen and their widows and orphans. This demand under the Austrian economical conditions, is of vital importance to the working classes, and the Bohemian Social Democracy is firmly determined to do its full share in compelling the Austrian government to take the necessary steps in this direction.

In the last two years the party has also achieved notable successes by participating in numerous elections in connection with institutions erected for the benefit of the working class. This is especially true of a great number of institutions insuring the workmen in case of illness (*Krankenkassen*). These institutions are conducted by delegates elected from the rank of the employers and employees. Two thirds of the delegates belong to the employees and one-third to employers. An enormous majority of these institutions are therefore controlled by class-conscious workmen, by social democrats, the only party representing the Bohemian working classes.

The Bohemian Social Democracy has 5 representatives in an institute insuring the workmen of Bohemia against accidents during working hours. These representatives are also chosen by laborers and the Social-Democrats were elected by overwhelming majorities.

The party, acting in this respect on the Belgian plan, gives much attention to organizing youthful workmen and is meeting with success. A substantial proof of this fact is the growth of the Bohemian socialistic turning societies. These are mainly an organization of young Bohemian socialists. Their strength was demonstrated at a convention held at Prague in August, 1903.

The party organization is gaining in strength. In Bohemia, Moravia, Lower Austria, Silesia and Upper Austria there are now 395 Bohemian locals with 12,535 members in good standing.

Besides these locals there are, in the mentioned Austrian provinces the following Bohemian socialistic organizations: Seventy-one political clubs, 433 craft organizations, 235 educational clubs and 51 turning societies, altogether 780 organizations with a membership of about 51,326 persons.

Considering the strength of the party locals and organizations just named, we may safely say the Bohemian army of militant social democrats is at least 60,000 strong.

The Bohemian Social Democratic press is steadily gaining ground. Two Bohemian socialistic daily papers are published, one in Prague and one in Vienna. The party has altogether 14 political papers. Two of these, as already said, are dailies, one is published three times a week, two twice a week, five are weeklies, three are semi-monthlies and one is a monthly.

There are also 24 trade union journals serving the party.

Besides all these already mentioned papers the party publishes a scientific review, an anti-clerical weekly, a satirical weekly and a monthly devoted to art and literature.

The Bohemian Social Democratic party has 42 papers with a total of 12,000,000 numbers yearly.

The report of the delegates to the international congress led to an interesting discussion of revisionism. The debate revealed

an almost complete absence of revisionism among our Bohemian comrades. The convention adopted by an enormous majority a resolution commending the standpoint assumed by the delegates in favor of the Dresden resolution and against revisionistic tendencies.

As far as revisionistic tendencies among the Bohemian Social Democrats are concerned the writer thinks they never will grow to be an important factor. The representatives of revisionism are few in numbers. Their revisionistic leanings are simply due to a misconception of some of the Marxian theories, especially the economic interpretation of history. Besides some of the Bernsteinians are men belonging to the so-called academic classes in Bohemia, and this undoubtedly also influences their standpoint. They are yet mere reformers and hence their inclination to compromising, etc. But, as far as the writer is acquainted with Bohemian affairs, they never can make much headway. The Marx and Engels and to the motto of that dead social-democratic warrior, William Liebknecht: No compromise, no political trading!

CHARLES PERGLER.

Why I am a Socialist

I have heard the child-slaves weeping when the world was fair and bright,
Heard them begging, begging for the playgrounds and the light!
I have seen the "statesman" holding all save truth a vested right,
And the priest and preacher fighting in the legions of the Night.

I have seen the queens of fashion in their jeweled pride arrayed,
Ruby crowned and splendid—rubies of a baby's life blood made,
Richer than the gems of nature, of a stranger, deeper shade.
On their snow-white bosoms quivered as the dames of fashion prayed.

Then I looked into the dungeons where the brute men cringe and crawl—
Men to every high thought blinded—men who were not men at all—
And my eyes glanced upward to the men whom we "successful" call,
And the Beast was in their foreheads and their thrones about to fall.

And I've seen my father lying on his death-bed like a beast,
In his poverty forsaken, he a Southern soldier priest;
Seen his broken body tremble as the pulse of living ceased,
And his soul go outward, moaning, as the red sun lit the east.

And I've seen my little mother on her death-bed weep and moan
For the babies she was leaving in the great world all alone;
Heard her loving spirit, seeking something to atone—
How she feared the god of hunger! How she feared the heart of stone!

And you talk to me "religion" and "rebellion" you "deplore,"
You whose souls have never anguished at the death watch of the poor:
You who rape the starving millions and yet grasp for more and more,
Can you blame us if we curse you when the beggar's crumbs you throw?

In these wild and frightful moments I have felt my reason reel,
Felt an impulse like the tiger's over all my being steal;
Felt it would not be a murder if my hand the blow could deal
That would brand upon your temple the death angel's mark and seal.

Then I heard a voice crying, "Workers of the world, unite!"
And the vanguard of the Marxians broke upon my hopeless sight,
High above them, proudly waving, streamed the blood-red flag of Right,
As they faced the hosts of Darkness and the high priests of the Night.

Thoughts of murder vanished from me and the anarch ceased to reign,
For the scheme of life unraveled and, at last, God's work seemed sane,
And I took my place beside them, there upon Truth's battle plain—
And I stand beside them fighting till the world we lose or gain.

—COVINGTON HALL.

The Theory of Business Enterprise*

THE material framework of modern civilization is the industrial system, and the directing force which animates this framework is business enterprise." With this quotation Prof. Thorstein Veblen opens his work on "The Theory of Business Enterprise." We have no hesitation in saying that this work is the most searching analysis of capitalism ever published in the English language. Business enterprise, he tells us, is a very comprehensive term; "the scope of the process is larger than the machine." The two great fundamental facts of the machine process are the inter-relation of the productive process and the standardization of all things connected with it. This standardization begins with weights and measures, and soon extends to tools, materials and products. Next, are included services, and, finally, the entire population tends to be standardized to fit the machine.

"The motive of business is pecuniary gain, the method is essentially purchase and sale. The aim and usual outcome is an accumulation of wealth." To those whose idea of business enterprise is the furthering of production the statement that while "the end is pecuniary gain, the means is disturbance of the industrial system," will come with somewhat of a shock. The reason for this condition is found however in the fact that "The outcome of this management of industrial affairs through pecuniary transactions has been to disassociate the interests of those men who exercise the discretion from the interests of the community." In other words, an antagonism has arisen between the process of production and the interests of those who dominate industrial life. As a consequence he concludes that "The largest and assuredly the securest and most unquestionable service rendered by the great modern captains of industry is the sweeping reduction of business men as a class from service and the definitive cancellation of opportunities for private enterprise." The reason for this, of course, lies in the tremendous wastefulness of modern industry and the fact that things are produced for sale and not for use, and need only to have "a modicum of serviceability in order to be salable." Industry has become so completely depersonalized that there is no personal relation between the buyer and the seller, and consequently, the strongest motive to honesty is removed. However, he thinks that the present system to some degree "makes up for its wastefulness by the added strain which it throws upon those engaged in the productive work." A method

*The Theory of Business Enterprise, by Thorstein Veblen. Scribners. Cloth, 350 pp. \$2.00.

of compensation which does not carry great comfort to the working class.

The foundation of business enterprise is given by the institution of ownership. This idea of ownership has passed through two phases: first, it was supposed to arise from divine right, and this idea occasionally finds utterance to-day in the theories of stewardship of Rockefeller and the statements of such men as Baer. Later, however, this right of ownership, under the influence of the craftsmanship stage of the Middle Ages, came to be founded on production. It rests "in the assumed creative efficiency of a workman." This foundation having also passed away with the passing of the handicraft stage, the idea of ownership to-day rests upon "a habit of thought." Certainly a very unsubstantial foundation for a whole social system. This ownership is always expressed in money values and always with an assumption that the unit of money value does not vary, an assumption, which it is unnecessary to say, Professor Veblin recognizes as contrary to fact. "The all-dominating issue in business is the question of gain and loss. Gain and loss is a question of accounting, and the accounts are kept in terms of the money unit, not in terms of livelihood, nor in terms of the serviceability of the goods, nor in terms of the mechanical efficiency of the industrial or commercial plant.

The base line of every enterprise is the line of capitalization in money value * * * Investments are made for profit, and industrial plants and processes are capitalized on the basis of their profit-yielding capacity." In this capitalization loan credit plays a very great part. The return on any investment depends on the rapidity of the turnover—the turnover equaling the amount of capital multiplied by the length of time in which it is "turned over" in the business. The size of the capital can be increased by the use of credit and thus the product of the turnover be increased. But in a competitive world whatever *can* be done to increase profits *must* be done. Therefore "any concern involved in the open business competition which cannot or does not take recourse to credit to swell its volume of business, will be unable to earn a 'reasonable' rate of profits." Since this matter of loan credit was included in a monograph which was reviewed in an earlier number of this magazine, it will be passed over here with less notice than it really deserves. It is worth while however to notice even at the cost of repetition, the ingenious analysis by which he shows how the modern promoter has been able to "syncopate an industrial crisis" including all the features from the inflation of credit to the final shearing of the lamb, and doing it all at a single business transaction.

He next considers "The Theory of Modern Welfare" and tells us that "Before business principles came to dominate everyday life the common welfare, when it was not a question of peace

and war, turned on the ease and certainty with which enough of the means of life could be supplied. Since business has become the central and controlling interest, the question of welfare has become a question of price. Under the old regime of handicraft and petty trade, dearth (high prices) meant privation and might mean famine and pestilence; under the new regime low prices commonly mean privation and may on occasion mean famine. Under the old regime the question was whether the community work was adequate to supply the community's needs; under the new regime that question is not seriously entertained" "Formerly, therefore, times were good or bad according as the industrial processes yielded a sufficient or an insufficient output of the means of life. Latterly times are good or bad according as the process of business yields an adequate or inadequate rate of profits." He here propounds a theory of crises and makes these spring out of the operation of credit. In our opinion this is the weakest portion of the entire book.

He says, however, that only through monopoly can we escape the coming of crises. Even with these he discovers that: "The great coalitions and the business maneuvers connected with them have the effect of adding to the large fortunes of the greater business men; which adds to the large incomes that cannot be spent in consumptive expenditures; which accelerates the increase of investments; which brings competition if there is a chance for it; which tends to bring on depression, in the manner already indicated. The great coalitions, therefore, seem to carry the seed of this malady of competition, and this evil consequence can accordingly be avoided only on the basis of so comprehensive and rigorous a coalition of business concerns as shall wholly exclude competition, even in the face of any conceivable amount of new capital seeking investment."

Finally, he points out what has never before been noticed in exactly this form, at least by any standard political economist, that the workmen do not and cannot own and direct the industrial equipment and processes so long as private ownership prevails, and industry has to be managed on business principles. "The labor supply, or the working population, can therefore not be included in the ideally complete coalition suggested above * * * So that when the last step in business coalition has been taken, there remains the competitive friction between the combined business capital and the combined workmen."

He then proceeds to the chapter on "Business in Law and Politics" in which he informs us that: "Modern (civilized) institutions rest in great part on business principles." He finds naturally that America carries this principle farther than anywhere else. "Here, as nowhere else do obligations and claims of the most diverse kinds, domestic, social, and civil, tend to take the

pecuniary form and admit of being discharged on a monetary valuation." This grew out of the fact that for many years industrial relations in America were on the small capitalist basis and affected a large number of persons. The foundation of business principles is the freedom of contract, but while it is noticed that "physical impossibility may be pleaded as invalidating the terms of the contract * * * The material necessities of a group of workmen or consumers, enforced by the specialization and concatenation of industrial processes, is, therefore, not competent to set aside, or indeed to qualify, the natural freedom of the owners of these processes to let work go on or not, as the outlook for profits may decide. Profits is a business proposition and livelihood is not." The courts naturally derive their ideas from business principles, interpreting freedom of contract in accord with these principles. And the higher courts being more closely in touch with these principles apply them with a surer and firmer touch. The workers sometimes do not see the full justice of this, but as he says: "This extreme consequence of the principle of natural liberty has at times roused indignation in the vulgar, but their grasp of legal principles is at fault."

"Government at one time was an organization for the control of affairs in the interest of princely or dynastic ends, but since the advent of constitutional government and parliamentary representation, business ends have taken the place of dynastic ends in statecraft. * * * The constitutional government is a business government * * * And representative government must generally be representative of business interests."

The ground of sentiment on which rests the popular approval of a government for business ends may be summed up under two heads: "Patriotism and property. * * * Patriotism arises from a happy knack of clannish fancy by which the common man is enabled to feel that he has some sort of metaphysical share in the gains that accrue to the business men who are citizens of the same 'commonwealth.' In the same way the working man's idea of property is as an outgrowth of the discipline of the past." This idea of property in itself has had an important change. Instead of resting on production it has come to rest on possession, or as Professor Veblen states it "acquisition of property" has been considered "to mean production of wealth; so that a business man is looked upon as the putative producer of whatever wealth he acquires. By force of this sophistication the acquisition of property by any person is held to be, not only expedient for the owner, but meritorious as an action serving the common good." Business interests affect the governmental policy in various ways, one of the most striking of which is in the pressure for expansion or imperialism. "Armaments serve trade not only in the making of general terms of purchase and sale between the business men of

civilized countries, but they are similarly useful in extending and maintaining business enterprise and privileges in the outlying regions of the earth. * * * There is commonly a handsome margin of profit in doing business with these, pecuniarily unregenerate populations, particularly when the traffic is adequately backed with force. But, also commonly, these peoples do not enter willingly into lasting business relations with civilized mankind. It is therefore necessary, for the purposes of trade and culture, that they be firmly held up to such civilized rules of conduct as will make trade easy and lucrative. To this end armament is indispensable."

Perhaps one of the most striking chapters in the whole work is one on "The Cultural Incidence of the Machine Process." This is a study of the different ways in which the machine process affects various social factors. The workman is made into a machine so that the final form of his habitual thinking is mechanical efficiency. The machine process however divides society into two classes one of which is exclusively interested in "the work of purchase and sale and of husbanding a store of accumulated values." "The other," he tells us with fine sarcasm, "have been relieved of the cares of business and have with increasing specialization given their attention to the mechanical processes involved in production for the market." He shows how with the workers all possible exercise of the pecuniary or accumulative spirit has been abolished since, even in the purchase of their daily necessities prices are fixed by forces outside their control. As a result, one class thinks only in terms of property and profit, the other in terms of production and use. So that the two classes come to have an increasing difficulty in understanding one another. The business classes do their thinking on the basis of natural rights in property while the working classes are "habitually occupied with matters of casual sequence, and with hard matter of fact things which make it impossible for them to appreciate the conventional idea of property rights. As a result the working class come to have less and less faith in the action of governmental institutions dominated by property ideas. Finally, we are told, that when "distrust of business principles rises to such a pitch as to become intolerant of all pecuniary institutions, and leads to a demand for the abrogation of property rights rather than a limitation of them, it is spoken of as 'socialism' or 'anarchism.' This socialistic disaffection is widespread among the advanced industrial peoples. No other cultural phenomenon is so threatening to the received economic and political structure; none is so unprecedented or so perplexing for practical men of affairs to deal with. The immediate point of danger in the socialistic disaffection is a growing disloyalty to the natural-rights institution of property, but this is backed by a similar failure of regard for other articles of the

institutional furniture handed down from the past. The classes affected with socialistic vagaries protest against the existing economic organization, but they are not necessarily averse to a somewhat rigorous economic organization on new lines of their own choosing. They demand an organization on industrial as contrasted with business lines. Their sense of economic solidarity does not seem to be defective, indeed it seems to many of their critics to be unnecessarily pronounced; but it runs on lines of industrial coherence and mechanical constraint, not on lines given by pecuniary conjunctures and conventional principles of economic right and wrong." The fine sarcasm of this statement has few equals in economic literature. He tells us that the socialists do not look "to the redistribution of property or a re-organization of ownership" but rather "to the disappearance of property rights." While socialists agree with this, there is a note on this page stating that this was not the position of the "scientific socialism" of Marx and Engels. We are not exactly sure whether this is intended to be another joke for the purpose of throwing his orthodox readers off the track or not, but the statement is certainly not true, as Marx and Engels had as little sympathy with the cry of the "right to the full product of labor" as do the modern socialists. If any one doubts this let him read Lafargue's "Right to be Lazy" and probably few would deny Lafargue's right to speak authoritatively on Marxian socialism.

With two such opposing mental make-ups as that of the capitalist and the working class, there can be no reconciliation. "With the socialistic element the question is not what shall be done in the way of readjustment of property claims, but what is to be done to abolish them?" * * * "In this differential rate of movement the departure from the ancient landmarks has now gone so far (or is reaching such a point) among the socialistic vulgar as to place their thinking substantially on a plane of material matter of fact, particularly as regards economic institutions. The respectable classes will not, owing to their retention of the conventional property ideas reach 'a mature revolutionary frame of mind' consequently, the socialists maintain that their movement must be a proletarian movement in which the 'respectable,' that is to say, the pecuniarily competent, classes can have no organic part even if they try. * * * Instead of contrasting the well-to-do with the indigent, the line of demarcation between those available for the socialist propaganda and those not so available is rather to be drawn between the classes employed in the industrial and those employed in the pecuniary occupations. It is a question not so much of possessions as of employments; not of relative wealth, but of work. It is a question of work because it is a question of habits of thought, and work shapes the habits of thought."

In a note he has this peculiarly shrewd observance concerning another class which often hangs on the fringe of the socialist movement. "The unpropertied classes employed in business do not take to socialistic vagaries with such alacrity as should inspire a confident hope in the advocates of socialism or a serious apprehension to those who stand for law and order. This peculiarly disfranchised business population, in its revulsion against unasimilated facts, turns rather to some excursion into pragmatic romance such as Social Settlements, Prohibition, Clean Politics, Single Tax, Arts and Crafts, Neighborhood Guilds, Institutional Churches, Christian Science, New Thought, or some such cultural thimblery."

There is little tendency among the workers to substitute "new myths or conventions" in place of the old. They tend constantly to deal with hard, material matter-of-fact things and their effects on our social institutions.

His final chapter on "The Natural Decay of Business Enterprise" would in itself make a most excellent socialist propaganda leaflet for use among those who have learned to think in the economic jargon that is taught in the average capitalist university. He shows how absolutely hopeless is any effort to retain the body of thought and institutions built upon an industrial basis. The periodical press and standard literature has become so permeated with the insincerity of capitalism that it has really over-reached itself and today probably has less effect than is commonly thought. "The literary output issued under the surveillance of the advertising office is excellent in workmanship and deficient in intelligence and substantial originality. What is encouraged and cultivated is adroitness of style and a piquant presentation of commonplaces. Harmlessness, not to say pointlessness, and an edifying-gossipy optimism are the substantial characteristics, which persist through all ephemeral mutation of style, manner, and subject matter."

With fine sarcasm he suggests that the only possible way of maintaining our present society is by the introduction of a military discipline in that "there can, indeed, be no serious question but that a consistent return to the ancient virtues of allegiance, piety, servility, graded dignity, class prerogative, and prescriptive authority would greatly conduce to popular content and to the facile management of affairs. * * * "If national ambitions and warlike aims, achievements, spectacles, and discipline be given a large place in the community's life, together with the concomitant coercive police surveillance, then there is a fair hope that the disintegrating trend of the machine discipline may be corrected. The regime of status, fealty, prerogative, and arbitrary command would guide the institutional growth back into the archaic conventional ways and give the cultural structure something of that secure dignity and stability which it had before the times, not only of

socialistic vapors, but of natural rights as well. Then, too, the rest of the spiritual furniture of the ancient regime shall presumably be reinstated; materialistic skepticism may yield the ground to a romantic philosophy, and the populace and the scientists alike may regain something of that devoutness and faith in preternatural agencies which they have recently been losing. As the discipline of prowess comes to its own, conviction and contentment with whatever is authentic may return to distracted Christendom, and may once more give something of a sacramental serenity to men's outlook on the present and the future."

However, he concludes with: "It seems possible to say this much, that the full dominion of business enterprise is necessarily a transitory dominion. It stands to lose in the end whether the one or the other of the two divergent cultural tendencies wins, because it is incompatible with the ascendancy of either." To the socialist this conclusion is all that he could ask for. He has full faith that the proletariat will see to it that no military regime perpetuates business enterprise or supplants the ruling capitalism.

The question which comes up to the reader of the work is largely one of whether this sarcastic, cynical style is really one capable of producing results. To a large degree the book is unintelligible to one who has not swallowed the scholastic jargon of conventional economics. We cannot understand however how any follower of Laughlin, Sumner, or the standard capitalist economists can read this book and not become, if not a socialist, at least thoroughly convinced of the uselessness of his professionally acquired knowledge.

A. M. SIMONS.

A New Messiah

IN the November issue of the *International Socialist Review*, Mr. Franklin, the author of *The Socialization of Humanity*, complains that my article in the September number of this magazine is not an adequate review of his book. In order to show me how the job should be done, he seeks shelter behind Herbert Spencer and writes his own review.

Spencer was a great man. All great men have something small about them. Spencer's closing years were marred by what the Yankees very picturesquely call the "swelled head." This accounts for his bad taste in posing as his own reviewer on the rather modest ground that none of his critics had brains enough to understand him. Mr. Franklin begins his literary career by imitating the senile weakness of the great man. The reader may guess the rest.

My purpose was to write, not a mere review, but a critique, and thus to give simultaneously a glimpse of the drift of Mr. Franklin's book and a comparison of his so-called monism with my conception of materialist monism as I see it in the light of the socialist philosophy.

Mr. Franklin does not like this method. He grieves especially over my unkindness in drawing the veil from his contradictory style and presentation. He does not realize that the style is the man, and that the first requirement of a writer on monism is to solve the contradictions of traditional modes of thought and to demonstrate the consistency of his monism by the elimination of purely ideological contradictions and by the reconciliation of such apparent contradictions as are inherent in the evolution of things. So long as the student of his book is stopped in his advance by the rocks and shallows of contradictions, instead of being borne along smoothly on the resistless current of clear thought, just so long is there something wrong with the monism of the writer. A contradictory style is an evidence of contradictory thought. A consistent monist must rise above that level.

However, Mr. Franklin does not care to rise. So he continues the contradiction by giving the reader a contradictory summary of his contradictory book and by changing my statements into their contradictory opposite, in order to be able to contradict me and remain in his element. Thus he learns nothing and also misleads those who might be inclined to follow him. Luckily their number will not be alarming.

He admits that he is not familiar with the literature of socialism, yet he has the presumption to sit in judgment over the philosophy of our movement and to take his objections; all of which

bear the imprint of the tyro, from bourgeois literature. Even when he assumes to instruct me on one of the fundamentals of socialist thought, the materialist conception of history, he dips his knowledge from a bourgeois writer like Seligman, instead of going straight to the original sources. And he cannot plead as an excuse his inability to read foreign languages, for there is an abundance of translations in his own language by which to familiarize himself with the spirit of our movement.

He complains about my narrow interpretation of historical materialism and speaks of Marx's "doctrine of economic determinism," which, he says, has received a far too narrow interpretation. Yet his whole book is an evidence of his ignorance of the meaning of historical materialism as enunciated by Marx. The founder of scientific socialism has never given us any "doctrine of economic determinism." The quotation from Seligman, which is a translation of a statement made by Engels, shows that the materialist conception of history is not a narrow doctrine of economic determinism. And this quotation appeared for the first time in the English literature of this country in the first volume of the *International Socialist Review*, in an article entitled "Mind and Socialism." This article was written by none other than myself, and from this article Seligman, who is a reader of this magazine, very likely either copied this quotation or derived his impulse to study the German original. Mills then copied this quotation from Seligman, and Franklin copied it from Mills, for the purpose of quoting it against me and showing his superior knowledge of historical materialism. The joke is on Franklin.

If my opponent had taken the pains to familiarize himself with my position, as he should have done before entering into a controversy with me, he would have found that I have made a specialty of pointing out that the Marxian method of historical research is not a dogma, but the pilot to a new world philosophy. For obvious reasons I cannot quote my own articles and leaflets, but if Mr. Franklin is really interested in this subject, he can easily find out what I have written on this question. The merit of this historical method consists precisely in having demonstrated the absurdity of those social quacks who "hail their nostrums to the world" as the great panacea, or to speak with Mr. Franklin, the great "dynamic," which will change human nature. At its very birth, the socialist philosophy announced the bankruptcy of those philosophers who, like Feuerbach, and in this instance Franklin, are in accord with progressive thought so far as the past is concerned, but want none of it for the further evolution. Feuerbach said that "backward he was a materialist, forward he was an idealist." Franklin might say that backward he is a monist, but forward he doesn't know what he is. For he offers as the latest improvement of the socialist philosophy the very idea which

the founders of scientific socialism made the dividing line between bourgeois and proletarian thinkers. Marx and Engels, after going through the evolution from Kantian metaphysics, Hegelian idealism, and Feuerbachian semi-materialism, arrived at a scientific materialist and evolutionary materialism, which was further elaborated by Joseph Dietzgen into a proletarian world philosophy embracing the whole sweep of cosmic evolution, including the evolution of human societies and of the individual "soul." And in complete harmony with these teachers of mine, I have defined mind as the sum of physical and chemical qualities by which the evolution of the universe expresses itself in all phenomena, whether they take place in the mineral, the vegetable, or the animal kingdom. My conception of mind, then, is plainly a logical materialist and monist one.

For this reason I can afford to pass without further comment all the longwinded excuses for argument by which Mr. Franklin implies that I believe in a metaphysical mind back of nature, that my idea of co-operation is that of Manchestrian *laissez faire*, and that I am thinking of the "reminiscences of my childhood" when I refuse his anthropocentric idea of waste. By this method of argument, Mr. Franklin shows himself indeed as a reasoner who has not yet outgrown the controversial habits of his childhood days, and who will have to improve a great deal before he will be regarded as a mature thinker.

One illustration of his specious reasoning will suffice to illustrate all his objections. He says on page 276:

Mr. Untermann seems to think that the chief function of the critics is to point out contradictions, and wherever I have used a word in two different senses, for example, the use of the word nature, when I say: "Life and mind are developed in spite of nature, with its assistance;" and "It is the nature of matter and energy to develop life, mind and human society, as it is for them to manifest themselves in any other way," he notes the seeming contradiction. Any one ought to see that nature is personified in the first sentence, whereas in the following, it is not; that the two sentences contrast naturalism with supernaturalism. Mr. Untermann follows this plan of criticism throughout, often criticising the nonsense he sees in one sentence through misunderstanding with the sense he really understands in another.

A few sentences before he takes me to task for personifying mind, which, by the way, I have not done. He says this would lead to "mysticism, metaphysics, and superstition." And so it would, if I regarded mind as a metaphysical entity. But if mind is regarded as part and parcel of matter, there is no more danger in personifying mind than there is in Mr. Franklin's personifying of nature. For mind is then a part of nature. But he thinks that he has made a crushing argument, when he makes a verbalist distinction between nature in one sentence and nature in the other. I think I am expressing myself clearly enough, even for Mr. Franklin, when I reply that, according to materialist monism, the

nature of nature is the same as the nature of a part of nature. The reader may judge for himself, then, who has written "nonsense."

Mr. Franklin claims to have appreciated the function of class struggles and stated it plainly, although in different language from myself; that he has arrived at his conception of class-consciousness by a study of all nature; and that in his opinion the socialization of humanity will be brought about by the unconscious forces of nature. If that means anything, it means that the elements of nature will make the proletariat class-conscious. Very well, I am willing to admit that they will. But who will recognize the historical function of the proletarian class struggle in this wishy-washy statement?

It is precisely here where the socialist philosophy asserts itself. Our conception of historical materialism, is indeed, as Mr. Franklin understands, in its application to social evolution, a part of the philosophy of monism in general. According to our conception, men, the products of the evolution of the elements of nature, are compelled to produce food, clothing and shelter. In so doing they produce tools and by their help modify their mode of production, the nature of food, clothing, and shelter, their environment, and their own nature, including the sum of those physical activities known by the name of mind or soul. For several thousand years, the social environment of man, and thus his nature, has been modified by the existence and development of economic classes with antagonistic interests. Further essential changes in human nature will only follow when these class distinctions are eliminated from human environment. And this elimination will inevitably follow as the outgrowth of economic and political class struggles. These class struggles cannot be abolished by any philosophical, religious, or moral recipes. They can be abolished by no scheme grown in the individual brain of any single thinker. Their abolition must and will be the outcome of the entire human development. So long as human society lives in two different social environments, it is futile to brew ideological remedies which are supposed to apply to all of society regardless of class environment. Each class can only be moral and philosophical according to its historical condition. All other morality and philosophy has but a paper life. Hence each class must become conscious of its historical place and function, and use its strength, its enthusiasm, its ideologies for the evolutionary development of its own historical function. The socialist party thus becomes the historical product of a definite stage of human, and in a wider sense, of cosmic development. It does not owe its existence to one thinker, but to the fact that one or more thinkers were compelled by their environment to enunciate certain thoughts which correspond to the environment of a certain class. To attempt to think anything

else would mean to think something which would find no response in the minds of those who are compelled, by their historical condition, to act in a certain way. For this reason, bourgeois thinkers have no message for the class-conscious proletariat.

But the socialist philosophy, just because it is a logical part of materialist monism, does not stop at the historical function of class struggles. Just as astronomers are enabled to discover new stars by a computation of the elements of known stars, so the socialist thinker can foretell the course of human evolution after the abolition of class struggles by an analysis of the movements of present day evolution. Hence we arrive at a monistic world philosophy and recognize that the next stage of society, collectivism, will produce such changes in the social and natural environment of man, that human nature will be changed to an extent of which few are today aware. We can even trace the outline of the physical evolution and indicate what parts of the human mechanism will be changed by the environment of collectivism. But this would lead me too far for the requirements of this article. Enough, by the help of the socialist philosophy, we are enabled to foresee that man as we know him today will not be the last link in the evolution of vertebrates, and that the environment of the higher vertebrate will be as different from ours as ours is from that of the cave dwellers.

But at the clear enunciation of the class struggle and of its function, Mr. Franklin's bourgeois mind balks. The inconsistent character of his monism is clearly revealed by his endorsement and acceptance of the imbecile objection that socialism cannot come unless we first change human nature. He makes this objection the starting point of his whole book, the inspiration which prompts him to retire into the solitude and find a "new dynamic" which, according to him, the socialist movement lacks. And thus he arrives at his "new religion," and after he has found it, he "hails it to the world," and all the world has to do now in order to be saved is to accept his religion and be blessed for ever more. He writes a hundred pages to show that material evolution produces man and his ideas, and yet he is blind to the fact that fifty years of proletarian evolution would surely have produced that "new dynamic religion" long before the illustrious Franklin retired to discover it, if in the dialectic of things such a religion were the logical outcome of the historical environment of the proletariat. With over seven million socialists clasping hands around the world, this philosophical Rip Van Winkle speaks of socialism as the "choice and watched doctrine of a band of persecuted spirits crowded in some garret to starve and dream." With the entire bourgeois world scurrying under cover to escape the searching light of this new world philosophy of millions, he says socialism will not amount to anything, unless it becomes "a

philosophy of existence, a system of living, a religion that will take the place of christianity." This is what socialism has already done for millions, and what it will do for the entire human race, and no one has declared this so often and so strenuously as the scientific socialist. But we are not in love with the term "religion." We know that religion has come to be historically connected with dualist metaphysics, and therefore, as consistent materialist monists, we reject the term and prefer to call our philosophy the science of life. But we are well aware that this science, this living "religion" is a thing of the future, which has very little chance to find expression in anything but thought so long as capitalist environment lasts. And though we are trying to live it as well as this environment will permit us, we are daily reminded in our own bodies of the impossibility of living an angel's life in a devil's environment. Therefore the socialist party, instead of "hailing a new religion to the world," occupies itself with the task of the present, the fulfillment of the historical mission of the proletarian class struggle, building that better foundation on which the higher race of the future will rise.

Not so Mr. Franklin. Unless we accept his religion, the socialist movement will be powerless. His "religion" is indeed materialistic enough. But nevertheless it will not be the dynamic of the socialist movement. Our dynamic is the class struggle, and our philosophy cannot find any other living expression until this struggle is over. At any rate, if we were inclined to adopt the term religion and define its meaning, we should not accept the following definition of Mr. Franklin:

"Religion is the ultimate development of the primitive internal energy constituting matter, which causes it during the universal process of adjustment and readjustment of external radiant energy and internal gravitant energy, to unite into higher and higher organizations, beginning with molecular compounds and ending with humanity. Religion is the ultimate form of internal energy of matter which binds all organizations together. It begins with chemism in chemical combinations, then extends to living compounds. * * * In a still more differentiated form it unites the sexes in love. In its highest differentiated form, it begins by binding animals into species, men into clans, tribes into nations, and finally as religion, it will unite humanity into one great organism. Religion is the energy of society, as feeling is the energy of the individual, and chemism is the energy of chemical compounds."

There is a whole lot of binding in this definition, but it takes little account of the negative forces in the cosmic evolution. If binding is the essence of religion, then paste is crystallized religion and the binding business a type of the true practice of religion. Then commerce is a religion and Adam Smith is right.

Then the "callous cash nexus" is the religious nerve which now binds man to man, and capitalism is the true religion of the ideal man, as the bourgeois sees him. You can justify anything with such a definition of religion.

The proletariat is just emerging out of the darkness of the metaphysical religions. By its very historical birth and development, the philosophy of the proletariat is arrayed against any and all metaphysical humbug. If any one wishes to retain the old term and read a new meaning into it, that is his personal privilege to which no one can seriously object. But to hail this purely individual and by no means new conception as a new evolutionary force for a movement which has already fully evolved its own independent philosophy and is conquering the world through it, that is an acrobatic feat which I gladly leave to Mr. Franklin, the Messiah of the "new dynamic."

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

Apocatastasis

A youth ambitious sought a hermit gray,
With, "Sire, I seek for fame, show me the way!"
A smile of scorn crept o'er the aged lips,
But pity put it in complete eclipse.
"The way is long," said he, "as human breath,
And every day holds up the stones of Death.
These fall at last, nothing for aye endures;
Be wise and good, all else are fleeting lures!"

He clasped his hands, and shook his snowy hairs,
Grown calm by many years of weary cares.
"Nay, sire," the youth exclaimed, "I'll make my way—
And plant in steel and granite things to stay!"
"What lives within the hearts of men as truth
Alone are worth your care, oh, virile youth!
Bear these—some granite pebbles, rods of steel—
At every step, as victor, in your zeal.

"Thrust down a rod. But when, alas, you fall,
Drop there a pebble through your coat of mail."
So passed the twain; the one to final rest,
The other bearing still his living quest.
Long ages after one pale student read
This legend from the tender hermit dead,
Who wrote "That way he went among the hills."
"Now," said the student, "this my wishes fills.

"I'll trace his path, and read his story through."
His dreary way no steel nor granite knew!
The air corrosive, turned the steel to rust—
And rain had solved the granite down to dust.
There as of old the cruel "trust" arose,
Built high its ill-got gains thro' Labor's woes,
Whose wives and children flood the age in tears,
While ill-got wealth is yet the sport of years!

The pyramids decay—Mongolian walls—
And every work of man to ruin falls.
They only mark Ambition's tears and blood
Forced from the toilers in an endless flood.
Only the thought that leads to joy survives,
For happiness belongs to human lives.
And greed alone is from the Demon race,
Whose acts must perish in profound disgrace.

—ISAAC A. FOOT.

Letters of a Pork Packer's Stenographer

LETTER NO. VI.

Chicago, Ill., May 8, 190--.

My Dearest Katy:

IT is Saturday evening, and almost 12 o'clock, and I am in my little ten by ten room, very cosy and comfortable, determined to have a long, uninterrupted talk to you; for this is the season in the week when I am pleased to fancy myself a young woman with leisure for thinking, with the open sesame to hear good music; with a library, and nothing to do but enjoy it; with frocks in my closet and money in the bank; when Teddy takes me to the concert, or the theater, and we have a supper at the Bismarck, and I sit up very late writing to my friend with the delightful prospect of sleeping till nine in the morning; when I forget my troubles at the packing house, and the discouragements of doctor bills; when I scorn my type-writer, and mock at the common-place—when I pretend that I am free, and dream dreams! And O the luxury of a Sunday morning, when I waken at the usual hour to realize the joy of being able to turn over and go to sleep again! When I bribe the chamber-maid to bring up a cup of coffee, and a bit of toast, which I eat in the abandonment of laziness, in my robe de nuit! And then to snuggle back into my pillow for another half hour, believing, with utter content, that all good things must come, if I but work and wait! Were I an infidel, I think I could never wholly scorn a religion that has given to the workers one day of rest!

Teddy and I have been down to McVicker's to see "The Land of Dixie." We were too late to get tickets at Powers', and having heard some one say (we can neither of us remember on whom to fasten the blame) that the play was "clever," we dropped in. We enjoyed ourselves, as usual, for it would take a pretty big cloud to darken our sky on Saturday night. The play was so very bad it was almost good, and so copiously did the ladies about us weep at the thrilling parts and the "Elizabeth crossing the ice music" that we were unable to control our risibilities.

It was truly a wonderful play! A knock-down and drag-out in the first act, the youthful Hero overcoming the mighty Villian—a robbery and murder in Act II, when the Hero appeared, unfortunately, just in time to be *suspected*, but a Little Girl, out in the storm (nobody knew why), witnessed the bloody deed, and when the Common Herd growled at the Hero at the close of the third act, and the Villain hissed, "And WHO can PROVE that YOU did not MURDER Gerald Bovowsky!" this dear Little Girl runs in, bawling, "I can!" She seems not to do it, however, because the

World believes the word of the drunken Villain (who has led a wholly disreputable life) against the spirited assertions of the Hero (who was the Choirmaster in the Village Church), and He talks to the Heroine about the Past in the fourth act, with the blood-hounds poking their noses through the cracks in the sides of the barn; but just as the Sheriff and his Posse begin to batter down the barn door, she gives the Hero her horse, and he escapes in spite of shot and hound.

If anything could possibly be more exhilarating than Act IV, it was Act V, because all the clouds were dispelled, and the Sun shone so brightly that it lighted the whole theater. The Villain was dragged to the front of the stage bleeding copiously, and snarled and growled and finally confessed that the Little Girl, who had grown to be a charming young Lady during the Play, was the daughter of an Earl, and that he, and not the Hero, had committed the awful deed. Then the Aged Father wept bitterly because he had "fostered such base suspicions against his noble Boy," and the Widow mourned because her husband had never returned from the War; and the Heroine wailed because the Hero was "Out in the World alone." But finally the Villain was hauled off the stage—to prison and the rope, and the Hero and the Widow's Husband came stealing in "at the Garden Gate," and the old Earl, by some fortunate chance, ran into the arms of his long-lost daughter. And the curtain went down with the Widow fainting on the breast of her spouse; the Hero gazing into the starry eyes of the Heroine, and the old Earl, showering upon his newly found child the wealth of his stored-up affection.

It reminded me very much of "The Duke's Secret" we heard when we were little girls in the sixth grade, and "Prizes were presented to every Lady holding a Reserved Seat."

But the American Drama has evolved a step or two since those days, and is really on a much higher plane than American Literature. An interesting little French Professor has been added to the list of Mrs. Crosby's guests, and we are favored in having him sit at our table. He was simply charmed with my views on French Literature, and I thought he would embrace me on the spot on learning that Balzac, Victor Hugo, de Maupassant, George Sand, Dumas, Rousseau, and his adored Emil Zola were among my favorites! He was so pleased and grateful indeed, that he hunted about in his memory for an American novelist, whom he could justly praise, but failing, the gallant little man apologized because he "knew so little about our great writers." I made as much as I could of Hawthorne, and Washington Irving, and a few of our moderns like Mary E. Wilkins, and turned the conversation into an essay channel and dragged in Emerson and Thoreau, and finally—Walt Whitman—and I confess—I thanked the gods from the bottom of my heart—that this glorious singer was an American.

Mrs. K., a dear, foolish, useless little woman, who sat opposite, and considers herself a "great reader," suggested "The Days of Chivalry," "Lady Dorcas," and "A Love Story of the French Revolution," but I blushed to introduce him to historical novels, whose only local color consists in a few "Mahaps, Methinks," and an old-fashioned gown or two. I wanted to suggest George Ade, which, had he been long among us, any Frenchman would delight in; but Mrs. K. said, that "Mr. Ah'day was funny; but not DEEP!" Mrs. K. is a "Parlor Intellectual," and "deep" things are her strong suit.

Sometimes I think it odd that so few of our artists have appreciated the choicest bits of coloring, the truest picture, the greatest sacrifice, the deepest pain, here in America, and that nearly all of them have had to dig in the far-away-ages of the Past, in order to find romance, interest, plot and tragedy.

Was there ever a Mistress of Kings who commanded more servants, wore costlier jewels, finer gowns, or who ruled over more establishments than do our American heiresses to-day! Or King more potent than our monied masters, who own the things on which our lives depend! Or slave more bound than we, who bargain with them for a chance to work and live! Is there any tragedy, I wonder, to equal the life of a young girl, whose wages are four, and whose expenses six dollars a week!

If I had the tongue of angels, I would sing the story of the Working People!

I note, by your letter, how much you like Prof. Hadley's course on the Trusts, and I have read, with a great deal of interest, your brief review of his viewpoint. And, as far as he goes. I most emphatically agree with him. What IS the use of having ten factories when two will accomplish the necessary work, or a Middle-man, when it is a saving of labor to do away with the Middle-man. Combination certainly DOES do away with the useless—useless labor, useless establishments, useless waste, useless everything, save the profit-drawing, useless Sylvias. Trusts do also regulate the supply. They produce all that is necessary and no more—which is another sensible feature.

But here is where your University Professor stops, and here is just where I go on. He may SEE further, but selfpreservation probably dictates that he say nothing to offend the so-called University Benefactors. There was once a University Professor who taught the truth, and offended the man who held the pocket-book; and he lost his job. Perhaps he stands as an example to those who remain.

If, instead of the present form of the private Trust, all the working-men of the world united to do the necessary work of the world in the best possible manner, in the least possible time, each worker to receive the fruits of his individual effort, I think this form of combination would be beneficial to everybody. It

seems to me, that if Justice prevailed in a land of "Over-production," everybody who worked would have enough.

But the Trusts, as they exist to-day, are not formed for the purpose of lowering the market price of any commodity, nor for shortening the working hours of labor, or raising the wages of labor. They are formed for the purpose of cutting down the "cost of production;" gaining control of the market, and finally—and entirely—for making larger profits for the benefit of a Few.

And I want to say right here that there is only one item that can possibly enter into the "cost of production," and that this item is Labor. Labor, from the miners, who wrest the treasures from the earth, and gave them value, from the Lumbermen, who fell the trees, from the men who build, run (and do NOT own) the Railroads, on through the factory, where other bands of workers mold the metal, or carve the timber, or dress the cattle, for the use of the World. It is Labor only that produces wealth, and the "cost of production" is the wages paid to Labor for the wealth it has produced. The cost of production (wages paid to Labor) plus the profits, equals the market price of a commodity.

Profits are what a man's employes earn, and do not receive; or what his customers purchase, and do not procure. If the employer rendered unto his customers the full value of their money, or unto his employes the full value of their work, he would have no profits, and the world would be minus its millionaire Sylvias.

When a customer pays my employer \$5.00 for work that I have done, and for which I have received only \$1.00, it is obvious that either the customer is being cheated, or else, I am.

We know very well that the Trusts of to-day, having secured control of the market, make their own prices. And we see the price of all Trust-made commodities going steadily skyward, in spite of the fact that the cost of production has greatly decreased.

Take the Beef Trust for an example. We represent the only market in which the farmer and stockman can dispose of their produce, cattle and hogs. We represent the only market on which the People can buy. A few representatives of the Trust convene every morning to decide upon the market price of the cattle we *buy*, and the market price of the beef we *sell*. And I only ask you to note, that cattle were never so low, nor beef so high.

We read a lot in the papers about the prosperity of the working-man, about his glorious increase in wages, and his enviable condition all around; but we forget that during the past five years, the cost of living has almost doubled, and that a man's wage is not the amount of money he receives, but what that money will

buy. It takes nearly two dollars to-day to buy what one dollar would have bought a few years ago.

I think our "understanding about prices" with former competitors, is another of Pierpont's innings, and that he tipped it off to Papa Graham that while it did pay better to advertise than to keep expensive salesmen on the road, it would pay still better to join hands with the big four and control the market. And so Old John is able to "milk the critter coming and going, and milk her DRY," as he wrote Pierpont, in those letters, he wanted to do. And the critter, of course, is the Public.

It seems to me that combination is only another step in the evolution of society; but I believe that the benefits should be reaped by you and me, and all the workers, as well as Sylvia, or by you and me rather than Sylvia, because we are useful, while she is merely an ornamental, member of society.

The Packing Company contracted for a new sausage machine to-day, which will enable them to turn off half the men employed in that department. It will—in the usual way—materially lessen the cost of production, but having a monopoly, they will not need to lower their selling prices.

After all, what benefit has Labor ever received from the "labor saving" inventions? I cannot recall a single instance where the full benefit has not been reaped by the drones alone.

That disagreeable Mr. Edison has invented another labor-displacing machine! This time it is an automatic type-writer that will accomplish the work of ten stenographers. I would enjoy seeing one of them write Mr. King's dictation, and I would love to see the Branch House Managers trying to make out what Mr. King was talking about. It takes a clairvoyant to be able to please Mr. King.

If Mr. Edison lives long enough, it will only be a question of years until all the unpleasant drudgery of the world's work can be done by machinery, and we, useful people, will be minus our jobs. The country is ever, by the aid of these new inventions, growing more productive. By and by, I suppose, a few over-worked workingmen, with the aid of these machines, will be able to produce enough to supply the whole world, and the condition of the working man and woman will be much worse than it is now, because the total wages paid to them for producing all the wealth of the world will be so low that they will be able to buy back only a very small percentage of their product; and society will be in a constant state of panic.

We boast about our scientific age, and strut about telling of our wonderful machinery, and brag about the productiveness of America, but I wish we could have a chance to be proud because every citizen of America—and every citizen of the world—owned his own home, was sure of his job, and had plenty to eat and wear. The prosperity of a country does not depend upon the

goods we export; nor the size of our standing army, nor the millionaires to whom we pay tribute, but upon the wealth that is produced, and the justice with which it is distributed among the workers who have produced it.

In another ten years, I suppose the Packing Company will have overhead chutes from Texas to Chicago, into which steers as tough as cactus roots can be stimulated to march northward by the aid of gently administered electric shocks, being fed on the way by the farmer's latest harvest, so that by the time they have walked to the Packing House, they will be corn-fed, and ready to be killed.

Transportation can be saved on the corn and on the cattle. A man will sit upon the top of the Packing House and watch the process through a telescope, and guide the feeding of nations by the pressing of a button—or, very likely, they will have a little boy, or even a little girl, the younger, the cheaper. Automatic type-writers and accountants will be in use. A man in Georgia will drop a five dollar bill in a slot when he wants a porterhouse steak, which will be shot to him through a compressed air tube from Chicago—and we—where will we be!

I have been helping out on some special work in the Fertilizer Department to-day. When I found their attitude toward their customers promissory, solicitous, and concillating, I knew there was a reason, and a good reason for this unusual courtesy on the part of the Packing Company, but I think you will agree with me that the reason is obvious. Fertilizer is not a necessity, and meat is. You have to have your meat, and so you come to the only people who have it, but it is an altogether different proposition when we come to unload our fertilizer on a customer.

Not so very many years ago, what we now use for fertilizer was thrown away, but we have learned to make all things result in the glory and profit of Graham & Company. A very little labor spent upon a former waste, nets us many thousands of dollars yearly. A land-owning farmer is always good, so we unload our fertilizer on him in the fall, and take his notes, payable the following autumn, at 8 per cent, and 8 per cent upon refuse that nobody else wants, is a pretty good investment, and we always get our money in the end.

I wrote a letter for Mr. Diedrich, head of the Fertilizer Department, to-day, extending the time on half a dozen farmers' notes 30 days, in answer to a letter from one of our Agents, advising us that these farmers had not made enough on their wheat crop to pay for the fertilizer, and wanted a little more time to fatten, and bring their hogs to market.

The clock is just striking two, and I must say Goodnight. Write often, and tell me all about your studies, and don't neglect to say what impression Charlie Watson has succeeded in producing upon a certain stony-hearted little chit at the University.

Take my advice, Katherine, and guide your affections into a feathered nest. Since you are still fancy free, seek to rivet your happiness by falling in love with a man who has a reasonable bank account, and a possible future. Steer clear of the rock on which your Mary fell, for Teddy hasn't the slightest prospects of ever earning more than \$65.00 a month. And little Teddies, and little Marys, on \$65.00 a month, is too much for your worldly-wise Mary. And who can tell! Though her heart has stranded, her wits have not, and she proposes to hope on, and work on, until book-keepers become scarce, or employers just—or Utopia arrives, and young men earn enough to get married on. So I am cautioning my Kate to beware of hidden shoals before it is too late. Love is a very beautiful thing; but love united with comfort, and a few of the other pleasures of life, is a much more substantial and enduring emotion.

But whatever may be your lot, dear, I can never wish you greater happiness than to find such a friend as Teddy has been, as, step by step, he has guided my feet in the paths of intellectual progress, with broadening horizon, and an endless road.

Goodnight again, and pleasant dreams, to my dearest friend,

From her own

MARY.

EDITORIAL

Is a Radical Capitalist Party Possible in America?

In view of the tremendous growth of the Socialist vote at the last election the frightened capitalists of America are agreeing that the only thing that can save plutocracy is a radical pseudo-socialistic party. The unanimity with which both Democratic and Republican writers have accepted this point of view is interesting.

The desire for such a party is undoubtedly here, but is its formation a possibility? Do the industrial elements exist upon which it can rest? A brief historical survey of industrial and political conditions will help us on this point. In the crisis of 1893 and 1894 the small capitalist class of America was crushed. So far as constituting an important factor in industrial life in America is concerned they were wiped off the map. Nevertheless they persisted as individuals clinging on to the exploiting system and thoroughly impregnated with the competitive bourgeois point of view. The great trusts had risen to industrial and political domination. They demanded world markets, imperialism, a great navy and all the other policies consonant with their industrial position. The little competitive capitalists who had ruled this Government under various political names since the Civil War did not wish to give up without a struggle. They rallied under Bryan in a demand for a set of reactionary measures. They could not enter into the foreign markets in competition with the great trusts; therefore they opposed imperialism. They could not exist in the domestic market alongside these powerful competitors; therefore they cried out for anti-trust legislation. They were largely a debtor class; therefore they wanted a depreciated currency. They went down to absolute defeat in two campaigns.

By this time they had grown too weak to control either of the great political parties. Therefore they were logically kicked out of control of the Democratic party and both parties were ruled by the great capitalists. Now the great trusts have shown that they still have more faith in the Republican than the Democratic machine and once more democracy has gone down. Now the cry comes that again democracy shall be reorganized or else that a new party shall appear that shall once more represent this now extinct class of petty parasites who seek for a return to Jeffersonian democracy and pre-monopolistic industrial conditions.

When we come to examine our present society, however, we find that

there is no place for such a party. The industrial foundation upon which all political organization must rest shows but one sharp line of cleavage; that between capitalists on one hand and the producers of wealth upon the other. Within both of these classes, however, there are slight differences. Slight at least in comparison with the great basic cleavage. Within the capitalist class we still have the division between competitive and non-competitive capitalists; between the great trusts and the non-monopolized but still powerful industries. However, these two classes are so strongly united in their antagonism to the great producing class that there is little reason to believe that this second line of cleavage will become of great political importance. Within the producing class there is also two quite important divisions having somewhat different interests. Again trifling in comparison to their great fundamental antagonism to their common exploiters. This division is that between the farmers and the wage workers.

In both classes, however, there is one wing which, because of the advanced industrial position it occupies, is capable of setting the pace, of determining the motion of the whole class to which it belongs. Within the capitalist class it is the great concentrated industries which are able to control directly or indirectly the fortunes and policies of the entire capitalist class. We therefore can safely say that one great political party will represent their interests and that all those who desire the preservation of the principle of private property in capitalized wealth will follow their lead. They must do this or lose all. Among the producing class the wage working division occupies a similar point of vantage. It represents the industrially most advanced wing, and therefore the one which, by virtue of the laws of evolution, marks the path which others must follow. The wage workers are located in the great cities, from which radiate industrial, political and psychological impulses, and therefore their interests will dominate. Moreover, it has been shown over and over again that at bottom the interests of farmer and wage worker are identical. The farmer is beginning to realize this identity of interest, at least to the extent of a common antagonism to the industrial capitalist. The industrial conditions then foretell the formation of political parties along the lines of the great class struggle between the idle capitalist and the producing proletariat.

Turn now to the field of actual political events and see how far our philosophy is being justified. Any radical party must simply rest upon a general alliance of the discontented, and as we believe, the ignorantly discontented, since if they were intelligently discontented they would realize the truth of the socialist philosophy. But a discontented class made up of the elements to which such a party would appeal has the most contradictory interests, excepting on the one point of antagonism to the capitalist system, and this is the one point which it is supposed to ignore; consequently it would inevitably contain within itself all the elements of its own disintegration. The three great leaders (and the fact that it looks to leaders is but a sign of its reactionary unintelligent character) to whom it looks for salvation are Watson, Bryan and Hearst. The

first two of these are distinctly reactionary in all points and the last is so much of a mountebank and so shifting in his policy that it is difficult to classify him anywhere. He pretends to stand for the wage workers and union labor, and did he really do so he would be the strongest element in the combination. As a matter of fact, the only thing that he ever stands for is the selling of Hearst newspapers. It must be admitted that this is rather a shaky foundation upon which to build a political party.

Before analyzing these elements further, however, it is well to ask what it is that these gentlemen propose to reorganize and whether its reorganization is at their disposal. We remember the old receipt for cooking a hare was, "First catch your hare," and up until the present moment the Democratic party seems to be still safely in the control of Gorman, Hill, Cleveland, Belmont & Co.

Passing over for a moment, however, this rather important question about how a body of men who are not controlling a party are going to reorganize it, let us consider again the elements out of which they propose to effect their reorganization. First and foremost, any party which is to gain the backing of any large percentage of the Democratic party must rest upon the "solid South." But the "solid South" is the most reactionary portion of the United States. Indeed, it is far more reactionary than almost any other country calling itself civilized. It is specially backward in its relation to the labor question. Its notorious lack of child labor legislation, its disfranchisement of the entire working class population, both white and black, its medieval race hatred, all combine to make it the worst possible sort of a foundation on which to build a radical labor party. It would be a strange reversal of social laws if the most backward portion of the country were to lead in the organization of a radical party.

Another phase to be considered is the existence of reactionary radicalism within the Republican party. What reason is there to hope that they will leave that vigorous organization at a time when the spoils of office are most rich to go seeking the uncertain fortunes of a new party. For it must always be remembered that the only party that can live as a losing party and maintain its existence with no spoils of office is the Socialist party, because it, like its proletarian membership, has nothing to lose.

So much for the negative side of the question. These are the obstacles which stand in the way of the formation of a radical party, but there is one obstacle much more powerful than any of these, which is ordinarily overlooked. This is the Socialist party. This party has the overwhelming advantage in this case of being a vital moving element. It is doing something, whereas all of the other elements which have been considered are merely considering what they can do to keep themselves alive. No party can hope to become a great radical party unless it can displace the Socialist party.

Let us then consider whether the Socialist party is capable of fulfilling its historical function and incarnating the revolutionary forces of our present society. It has the advantage of having already taken the

initiative. It has also the much more important and more fundamental advantage of representing the only revolutionary advanced portion of modern society—the proletariat. Its organization, while not so numerous as the political machines of the other parties, is many fold more numerous than a party which is yet to be created. Neither is a membership of between thirty and forty thousand, which is rapidly increasing, to be despised by mere virtue of its numerical strength. But the Socialist party organization, as we all know, is many fold stronger than any organization which could be formed in the defense of capitalism. It is compact, disciplined, unified in its principles and purpose and is organized for work. It is located in those nerve centers of our industrial and political life—the great cities—and is therefore able to control the very source from which must spring any great political movement. It is in close connection with the great trade union movement, the control of which is absolutely essential to any even radical movement. The last election has shown that the Socialists within the trade unions are much more numerous than the adherents of the radical leaders before mentioned. The Socialist party has a press which, although far inferior to that of the great capitalist parties, is nevertheless of considerable importance, and is rapidly increasing in strength. It has a corps of trained speakers which will compare favorably, at least for proletarian audiences, with any that can be organized by a conglomerated radical party. It has its international connections, which are growing of very great importance in view of the increasing emigration. Most important of all perhaps, next to its position as a representative of the only historically revolutionary class of today, is the fact that it alone is able to carry on its campaign all year round, and that on a national scale. During the next three years it will be impossible for the elements of radicalism to create any national organization. Any party which still clings to capitalism must depend upon the spoils of office as an incentive to organization. These spoils will not be at stake nationally until the next presidential election. The Socialist party, on the other hand, occupies the entire national field continuously. Even municipal and state campaigns will be fought by the Socialists as a part of a great national and international struggle and all organization will be as a part of a national political party.

For all these reasons therefore—because of the irreconcilable contradictions within the small anti-monopolistic classes, and its dependence upon the reactionary solid South, and because of the positive organization of the Socialist party representing the only revolutionary class in modern society, and corresponding to the only essential class division within capitalism, carrying on a campaign along national lines all year round, in close touch with all phases of the labor movement, and having its forces in the great industrial nerve centers of our society—because of all these reasons we believe that the organization of a capitalist radical party of any importance is impossible and that the Socialist party is destined before many years to confront the party of monopolistic plutocracy in a final death grapple for supremacy.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

Probably the most uninteresting convention ever held by the American Federation of Labor occurred in San Francisco during the past month. Excepting the statistical report on organization and financial standing and a short debate upon the political question, which began in tolerance and good spirit and wound up in unnecessary personalities, nothing happened that could be considered above the line of mediocrity and perfunctory routine. Not even the jurisdiction tangles between various national unions which have heretofore been given much attention in the conventions, seemed to have the effect of arousing the delegates from their lethargy. There was a general air of indifference displayed by the organizations that are parties to controversies regarding the attitude of the Federation as a body toward the disputants.

To begin at the beginning: The annual address of President Samuel Gompers did not differ in substance from the speeches from the throne at former conventions. Mr. Gompers delights to dally with synonyms and to string them together in generalities of sometimes doubtful meaning. The president points with pride to the fact that dues-paying membership in the Federation has increased from 1,465,000 to 1,676,000 during the past year, which gain may or may not be due to Mr. Gompers' executive ability, or perhaps the direction of officers of national unions, or it is barely possible that some of the voluntary and obscure organizers had something to do with the result. But the world always gives the general all the credit for certain accomplishments while the corporals and the awkward squad are usually ignored. The increase in membership was very gratifying considering the antagonism that was manifest throughout the year, but the financial condition is not quite so satisfactory. President Gompers views with alarm the preparations of our capitalistic brethren who refuse to be conciliated and are adopting the policy of smash all along the line. Naturally after listening to the tales of woe of our worthy president—how Congress ping-ponged the eight-hour and anti-injunction bills into pigeon-holes and how various combines of capitalists insist upon hammering down wages, raising prices and forcing the shop open—one looks for some note of encouragement to labor to use the ballot intelligently and class-consciously to safeguard its interests and protect the people from the encroachments of capitalism by taking control of the governing powers and enact and administer the laws. But President Gompers' ponderous document contains no such hint. On the contrary, the Gompersonian policy, which has predominated for a generation, is reaffirmed and for another generation (or perhaps two or three if some of our so-called leaders have their way) the labor army of about two million men will be marched up the hill and then marched down again, and when they are up they are up, and when they are down they are down, and when they are in the middle they are in the middle, and are neither up or down.

There was hardly an organization represented at San Francisco

that is not confronted by some sort of menacing capitalistic combination. Yet the captains of the labor regiments sat around and smoked and looked wise and appeared supremely contented with the situation. In fact, the ultra-conservatives seemed more or less bored at the bare suggestion that "new occasions teach new duties and make ancient good uncouth, and that he must ever up and onward who would keep abreast of truth," or something like that. Mr. Gompers especially becomes very irritable when the old policy of pitting the stomach of labor against the money bags of capital and its political power is questioned. Several times, at the slightest provocation, he flew into a rage and charged those who criticized his tactics fairly with slandering and abusing him and with being in league with all sorts of evil sprits. Indeed, the Socialists who dare to question the infallibility of our most exalted chieftain would probably be excommunicated if he had the power to post a little list. While Gompers will mediate, conciliate, arbitrate and compromise with the capitalists, he shouts at the Socialists, bitterly and in words of thunder (which are quickly reproduced in 48-point gothic headlines in the daily capitalist papers): "You need expect no quarter from me; I will give you none!" So through the Gompers spectacles the Socialists are several degrees worse than the capitalists. But the Socialists need not fear decapitation at once—even a cat can look at a king, you know,—and such outbreaks of passion really cause no serious injury and are bound to have an opposite effect than that intended. There was no subject so generally discussed privately among the delegates as the large vote polled by the Socialist party last month, and they now understand that their actions in "smashing socialism" in the conventions of the past few years were boomerangs. Whether the "leaders" like it or not, the rank and file are moving, and some of the former will have to hurry to keep up with the procession before long.

There was no Socialist resolution introduced in the convention. It was unnecessary. Socialism is receiving plenty of notice at present—as much as is necessary to insure solid and substantial growth. Such was not the case formerly. But now the new recruits must be educated drilled, and absorbed, as a stampede of confused and unclear heads would prove a calamity. That was the principal reason for the presentation of a proposition by those delegates who believe in socialism recommending that affiliated organizations throw open their doors to the discussion of economic conditions, to have lectures upon these subjects in their lodge rooms and at the meetings set apart for this purpose, and to do everything in their power for the enlightenment and intellectual advancement of the proletariat. This resolution was adopted, the few votes recorded against it being cast by delegates who insisted that the Socialists would make political capital out of the action and claim their party had been endorsed. Despite this result the plutocratic press announced in sensational headlines that the "Socialists were routed," "Socialism was smashed" again, etc., etc.

As stated, the debate was good natured and fairly interesting for a brief period until the washing of dirty linen began. While, as in former conventions, the Socialists confined themselves strictly to the discussion of economic facts and political principles, their opponents frankly admitted that they would not discuss the principle of socialism, whose advocates were assailed as dreamers, union wreckers, liars, traitors, soap-box orators, afflicted with a disease, compared to opium eaters and smokers, and held up generally as all around villains. If any privately owned Socialist paper, anywhere in the country, attacks an officer the whole Socialist party is immediately held responsible, but never a word of condemnation is uttered against some of the sheets that hide under the cloak of trade unionism and brazenly garble the

truth and graft upon politicians and aim to sell labor votes to the highest bidder. Of course, no Socialist paper can benefit the movement by making unwarranted attacks upon anyone, and unless absolute proof can be produced to demonstrate the corruption of individuals, whether they be in or out of unions, such methods should never be resorted to.

At the close of the debate (?) Mr. Gompers—and he always closes the debate—in referring to as many crimes as he could remember of which the Socialists are guilty, mentioned the article I wrote for the October REVIEW regarding prospective changes in the A. F. of L. executive council and worked the sympathy game, as only Gompers can, by claiming that I had “denounced” him. But he did not deny that he was a candidate for United States commissioner of labor to succeed Carroll D. Wright, and that the powers that be favorably considered the idea of appointing him to the position, or that he attended a conference to discuss the matter. It is possible that I may have been misinformed, but the “tip” came direct from Washington, and some of Gompers’ own friends admitted in San Francisco that “the old man can have the job.” Let us wait for further developments.

The jurisdiction questions are just where they were before the convention assembled. The brewers are once more commanded to allow themselves to be dismembered or stand expelled in six months. As the brewers are not Chinese they will not obey the order with alacrity. The carpenters are also threatened with expulsion unless they let go of the woodworkers. “But,” said one of the brotherhood officials, sarcastically, “there is no date set when we are to be fired out.” The longshoremen defiantly announce that they will organize and better the conditions of all workers upon or along the waters no matter what the seamen think or say. The bridge and structural iron workers refuse to keep off the preserves of the boilermakes, and so the contentions continue all down the line. A resolution went through making it mandatory upon city central bodies to expel local unions not affiliated with the Federation, and thus if the brewery workers are really dumped overboard by the executive council the fight will be transferred to the floor of nearly every city central body in the country, and it requires no extraordinary foresight to understand that a great deal of trouble will take place.

The most practical thing that was done throughout the sitting of the convention was to levy an assessment upon the membership to support the striking and half-starved textile workers at Fall River, Mass., about 28,000 of whom have been battling against a reduction of wages below the dead line since last July. About \$75,000 was raised on the spot, and the struggling men, women and children were given new hope to continue the unequal fight against pauperdom and helpless wage-slavery.

Little else of general importance was accomplished. The convention was a transcontinental junket and cost the unionists of North America \$150,000 at the most conservative estimate. No wonder the initiative and referendum is growing in popularity among the rank and file.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

France

From France comes most encouraging news. The long fratricidal strife between rival socialist parties seems at last to be approaching an end. A committee of five has been appointed by the *Parti Socialiste de France* and the *Parti Socialiste Français* (The Jaureists and Guesdists) which includes an overwhelming majority of the socialists. The joint committee has already met and has decided to leave all question of disagreement to the International Socialist Bureau at Brussels. Under these conditions it seems certain that by our next issue, we shall be able to announce that the French Socialist movement once more presents a united front to the forces of capitalism.

A new semi-monthly magazine has just appeared, *La Vie Socialiste*. Its editor in chief is Francis de Pressense, a member of the chamber of deputies, and among its editors we note Comrade Jean Longuet, whose name is well known to the readers of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW. In a private letter to us he informs us that this publication will make one of its main objects the unifying of French Socialist parties. The editor in chief concludes an article in the first number on the "Congress of Amsterdam on Socialist Unity in France" as follows: That which is desired, that which must be obtained, and that which was happily prepared for under the auspices of the vote of the Amsterdam congress; the disappearance of fractions, the end of a fratricidal struggle and the ardent co-operation of all the Socialists of France in the name of a common principle, if by various roads, to the realization of their ideal of justice in a collectivist society."

Norway

During a debate in the Storting the Minister of State denounced Comrade Eriksen, a well known evangelical minister, and declared that it was "nothing less than horrible that men whose life work it is to preach the evangel of love and peace are seen acting as leaders in extending the gospel of class hatred."

Comrade Eriksen replied to this and in the course of his reply gave utterance to the following which may well be recommended to the perusal of some members of his profession in this country: "It seems to have been somewhat displeasing to the Minister of State that I have preached the class struggle, when my work is supposed to consist of preaching the gospel of peace. I am well aware of the philosophy, Mr. President, which holds that the ministers should bless the rulers of society, and that Christianity should be used as a cloak for everything existing, and that the ministers of the gospel should teach the poor to say that it is God's will that they should live in

the situation in which they now are and should be satisfied and contented. The ministry has certainly done this hitherto and it is comprehensible that the wrath of the conservatives is roused when one of us breaks with this custom and will have nothing more to do with it. I am glad, as a Danish Social Democrat has once said, that my hand has been raised against the most disreputable of all politics, the politics which consist in deceiving mankind in order to make it possible for the strong to set their feet upon the necks of the most miserable."

Germany

The *Volksstimme* of Magdeburg tells of a recent Agrarian congress which was held in that city to discuss the question of forming a land-owners' chamber as a part of the legislative machinery of Saxony. In the midst of their discussion some one raised the question about the number of Social Democrats who might be land owners. One member declared that every land-owner who had less than one acre was also an industrial worker and was sure to be a Socialist. Another speaker declared that all those who owned less than eight acres were exclusively Social Democrats and unless the line was drawn above this point there would surely be Socialists in their new legislative chamber. Finally one member suggested that ten acres be made the limit as that would exclude most of the Social Democrats. To their horror, however, they found this would also exclude two members of the Agrarian party for whose benefit this legislative chamber was largely to be erected. Under these conditions it was finally decided to set the limit at one acre and the delegates consoled themselves with the hope that they might be able to convince the Social Democrat land-owners of the error of their ways.

The question of the relation of the trade unions to the Socialist party in Germany is again up and it now seems certain that all official connection between the two will be dissolved. Bebel has been advocating this for many years. It is worthy of note in this connection that a similar movement is starting even in Belgium, a country of the closest identity to the trade unions and Socialist movement.

Italy

The Associated Press has been filled with stories of the crushing of Socialism in Italy. Long editorials have even been written full of sage advice and warning to American working men based upon the "overwhelming defeat" of the Socialists in Italy. Now that the news has finally arrived through Socialist mediums it is discovered that this crushing defeat was in increase, according to first returns, from 162,000 votes at the last election to 301,000 at the present. This does not include Milan and several other cities in which the Socialists were strong. The total Socialist vote for all of Italy in 1900 was 215,841. If the cities not yet heard from give a proportionate increase the total vote will be fully double that of four years ago. It is doubtful, however, if the number of deputies which was 33 in 1900 has increased. Twenty-six were elected, however, at the first ballot and the Socialists took part in 29 of the second elections, but in every case there was a complete coalition of all parties against them. Nevertheless they were successful in at least two of these, giving them a total of 28 votes. In order to thoroughly understand what this means some little knowledge of the facts put forth by the reaction to stem the Socialist movement is necessary. The government itself took most

active measures to prevent Socialists from voting. Sixty-nine thousand troops were ordered under arms during the elections. All of these were thereby disfranchised. Then for the first time the clericals rushed to the rescue of the Italian government. In the first election this was done secretly and the pope still retained, so far as any public announcement was concerned, his traditional position of the "prisoner of the vatican," having no part in Italian government. In the second election, however, priests and monks were ordered to attend the polls dressed in their religious garb and this was done by thousands everywhere. Moreover the whole force of government was used to terrorize intending Socialist voters. In Ferri's district, for instance, the polling places swarmed with soldiers and policemen who did everything possible to intimidate those who intended to vote for him. All effort was in vain as Ferri was elected in three districts, from two of which he of course resigned, permitting a second election. Great sums of money were contributed by the capitalists; one single manufacturer, Count Raggio, having given three hundred thousand liras. That in the face of all this the Socialists were able to more than double their vote is most significant.

England

The recent municipal elections in England have seen a considerable increase in the number of Socialist representatives. The S. D. F. elected 11 out of 32 candidates nominated and the I. L. P. 43 out of 89. The S. D. F. candidates all ran as Socialists, while those of the I. L. P. ran partly as members of their party and partly as independent Socialists, and some simply as labor candidates. Altogether 95 labor and Socialist candidates were elected, a gain of 52 over the previous election.

Press dispatches bring word that the unemployed problem is growing constantly worse in England and that hunger riots are prevalent in many cities.

Switzerland

At a recent meeting of the executive committee of the Social Democratic party of Switzerland the question of the party platform came up for discussion. A committee was appointed to formulate the party's position on the Agrarian question. Another point over which there has been much discussion has been the relation of the Socialists to the militia system. The following resolution was adopted:

"The Social Democratic party rejects every proposition for legislation relating to military organization in which the use of troops against strikers is not forbidden."

BOOK REVIEWS

THE PRINCIPLES OF RELIEF, by Edward T. Devine, Macmillan, Cloth, 495 pp., \$2.00.

For the man condemned to become a professional worker in philanthropy, this is a most valuable work. It is written wholly from that point of view and is a model of condensed, yet adequate treatment of just the things which such a worker needs to know. So thoroughly is it adjusted to the wants and capacities of this class that it carefully omits a number of things which really belong under the subject treated, but which might have disturbed the equanimity of such a worker. The writer makes no suggestion of the possibility of doing away with a condition of society in which relief will not be a necessity (if we except a most indefinite paragraph on page 181), and tells us that "Relief may eventually come to be recognized as equally entitled to serious consideration" with "business, domestic life, religion and education." A very consoling observation for the professional salaried philanthropist! The work is divided into three parts. The first, "Principles of Relief," consists largely of practical suggestions for charity officials, together with some chapters on the causes of distress. These chapters are most ridiculously inadequate. The one on "Industrial Displacement" is especially striking for what it does not contain. Although this purports to cover the subject of unemployment, and although the statistics of the charity organization societies show that fully forty per cent of all distress is due to this cause (and this in spite of the fact that every possible excuse is sought by the average professional philanthropist to avoid assigning this as a cause), still this chapter is one of the shortest in the book and is most meaningless in its conclusions and analysis. He admits that "it is true there are instances in which the most desperate efforts to find employment are unsuccessful," yet does not seem to see that this fact (which instead of being exceptional and occasional, is chronic and omnipresent, as is proven by every strike), vitiates all his reasoning about "finding employment" and improving producers so as to make them efficient. If there are really more men than "jobs," then all that a charity organization, friendly visitor, employment bureau, or philanthropist can do is to decide *which* applicant shall have the job. By making certain individuals more efficient competitors, by giving them the assistance of the superior competing power of some benefactor, it is possible to decide *which person shall have the job*, but this does not make any more jobs. Right here we are very close to the heart of the whole "scientific charity" idea. When it is carefully analyzed it will be found that every single one of its principles are formulated with the definite, if often unconscious, object of increasing the number of active competitors and intensifying the competitive struggle for employment, thereby reducing the price of efficient labor power. The "able bodied beggar" who will not compete is the particular *beête noir* of Charity Organization Societies. The friendly visitor and

the whole system of continuous attention tends only to perfect the wage-earner as a competitor in the labor market. Sewing-rooms, "work tests," employment bureaus, etc., all work to the same end. Use this principle as a guide and the whole tangled maze of "scientific charity," with its apparent contradictions becomes clear as a mid-day sun.

The second part of the book is given up to "Typical Relief Problems." This too is of little interest save to the professional charity worker, and hence can be passed over in a review for readers who are little interested in this line. The third part deals with an "Historical Survey" of charity poor relief. The author points out, what should have been recognized long ago, that the English Poor Law had much less to do with the creation of pauperism than it has ordinarily been credited with. One would have thought that his recognition of this fact would have prevented his acceptance in the very next chapter of the equally fallacious statement that public outdoor relief in America is responsible for poverty. Sometime it may be hoped that mankind will come to generally recognize that no form of philanthropy has much of anything to do with increasing or decreasing distress. The historical portion of the work however is of distinct value to all students of social problems. It is interesting to note that the problem of charity arose in this country simultaneous with the introduction of the machine methods of production, the wage system and capitalism.

The fourth part deals with "Relief in Disasters," and points out the methods which have been used to meet such great calamities as the Chicago fire, the Johnstown flood, etc. Persons who are more familiar with the actual work of the Chicago Relief and Aid Society would modify his wholesale praise of the work of that organization.

LA SOCIOLOGIE ECONOMIQUE, by *Guillaume de Greef*. Paper, 250 pp. 3 fr. 75. *Felix Alcan*, editor.

All over the world social and economic writers are working upon the basis of historic materialism. This work is by the well known Belgian socialist and sociologist and is an important contribution to this topic. It consists of a series of somewhat disconnected essays. The first deals with definitions and considers the historical evolution of the idea of what he calls social economics. The fourth chapter dealing with the history of social economics and the fifth on historic evolution, are of the most interest to socialist students. The Marxian point of view is elaborated at considerable length and criticized by the author from a scholastic and popular point of view that has grown decidedly trite in these days. Economic materialism is true with some modifications, he says. We cannot see that the modifications suggested by the author are especially valid or vital to the matter under discussion. For those who read French however this work must make up an essential part of any bibliography upon historic materialism.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

Rebels of the New South.

This socialist novel by Comrade Walter Marion Raymond is now ready, and the many advance orders for it have been filled. In outward appearance it is one of the handsomest books our co-operative publishing house has thus far brought out, and it may safely be called the best novel of a distinctively socialist character that has yet appeared.

The entire profits of this book have been contributed by the author toward extending the work of our co-operative publishing house, so that every socialist who assists in circulating it will be doing a double service to the movement, first, in the propaganda work that every copy of "*Rebels of the New South*" will do among the non-socialists who read it, and second, in helping provide the means for publishing other literature.

As a rule, the first edition of a book does not pay for the printing, not to speak of the advertising, and the general expenses of the business must be earned out of the sales of subsequent editions. It is, therefore, encouraging that we can announce several new editions which the increasing demand for socialist books has made necessary within a month.

Love's Coming of Age.

This book of essays by Edward Carpenter (the third American edition of which has just been published) is the most successful attempt yet made to apply the socialist philosophy to the love-relations of men and women in this transitional stage through which society is now passing and to make some forecast of what these relations will be in the co-operative commonwealth. It need hardly be said that this book is in no way an authoritative expression of opinion. It binds no one but the author, and not even him if he has changed his mind since he wrote it; yet it is a work of more than ordinary thoughtfulness and suggestiveness, while it is a model of English style, and well worth reading for its literary form, quite apart from the opinions expressed. It treats the most delicate of questions without prudery and without vulgarity; its ethics are far removed from the codes of bourgeois society, but equally removed from the short-sighted egoism that considers only present gratification. In short, it is a book that no thoughtful socialist will willingly miss reading. (Cloth, \$1.)

The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.

Ernest Untermann's translation of this classic work by Frederick Engels has been reprinted within a month, and is now in its second edition. This great work was never accessible to American readers until brought out by our co-operative publishing house in 1902. It gives in condensed yet not difficult style the scientific data regarding the early evolution of human society which are absolutely essential to a clear understanding of the socialist philosophy. Engels has here digested the voluminous details

of Morgan's "Ancient Society," retaining the facts that are of importance to the student and discarding useless trivialities, so that by reading "*The Origin of the Family*" it is possible to get a working knowledge of Morgan's discoveries at a small fraction of the cost in time and money that a study of Morgan's book involves. But Engels has not merely summarized Morgan; that writer confined his researches almost entirely to the Iroquois Indians, while Engels has in "*The Origin of the Family*" added a study of the parallel conditions in the corresponding stages of growth through which European nations have passed. "*The Origin of the Family*" is the fifth volume in the Standard Socialist Series, and retails for fifty cents.

God and My Neighbor.

Robert Blatchford's latest and best book has been heartily welcomed both inside and outside the socialist movement, and the second American edition is now ready. "*God and My Neighbor*" is not a book on socialism, but on religion. It summarizes the objections to orthodox theology with the most admirable good-temper and the most delicious literary style, and the chapter on free will *versus* determinism is a fine application of the fundamental principles of socialism. The second edition, like the first, is daintily printed on paper of extra quality, and will make a suitable gift-book for any one not irrevocably committed to orthodoxy. (Cloth, \$1, paper 50 cents, postpaid.)

Socialism, Utopian and Scientific.

Five years ago our co-operative company brought out the first complete American edition of this masterpiece of Frederick Engels. Our fourth edition of it has just been printed, making sixteen thousand copies within five years. The price of our paper edition, containing 127 pages on fine book paper, has been fixed at ten cents, with the special rate to stockholders of five cents by mail or four cents by express. Previous to our issuing this edition, complete copies could only be had in the imported London edition at a dollar each. As this is one of the few books that are absolutely indispensable to any one desiring to understand international socialism, the importance of this service of our co-operative company can hardly be over-estimated.

Increase in Number of Stockholders.

There has been a steady increase in the number of co-operative stockholders. When the booklet "*A Socialist Publishing House*" was printed last March, the number was 815. As the December REVIEW goes to press, it is 1,007. There are probably a thousand readers of the REVIEW who expect some time to become stockholders. Why not now? A share of stock costs ten dollars; it may be paid for at the rate of a dollar a month if preferred. It gives the privilege of buying our socialist books at cost (price list and scale of discounts sent on application).

It may be urged that capitalist publishers will soon begin to publish socialist books. This is true. The Macmillan Company, of New York and London, has lately published two excellent books, "*Mass and Class*," by W. J. Ghent, price by mail, \$1.35, and "*Poverty*," by Robert Hunter, price by mail, \$1.62. We recommend these books and can supply them to any one who can afford to pay the prices fixed by the publishers; we are not allowed to sell at a discount. But the former of these books contains less matter, and the latter only a trifle more matter, than Ladoff's "*American Pauperism*," which we publish in cloth binding at fifty cents mailed to any address, or thirty cents including postage to our stockholders.

On a Cash Basis.

The debt of the co-operative company to non-stockholders is now nearly paid, the only obligation apart from the cost of books recently printed being a note of eight hundred dollars to a Wisconsin bank, on which seven per

cent interest is paid. There is also a note of sixteen hundred dollars, bearing six per cent interest, to a stockholder who would like to be repaid as soon as possible.

The offer of Charles H. Kerr, made last June, that he would duplicate out of the balance due him from the company every contribution made by others for the sake of clearing off the company's debt will hold good until the end of the year 1904. The payments thus far made on this offer are as follows:

Previously acknowledged.....	\$2,348.38
J. O. Duckett, South Carolina (additional).....	2.00
Wm. English Walling, New York (additional).....	50.00
Franklin McCluskey, Illinois	5.00
H. B. Asbury, Kentucky (additional).....	2.60
Rev. Aaron Noll, Pennsylvania	1.00
L. W. Lang, Iowa.....	.25
James Howarth, Massachusetts.....	1.00
A. Schroeder, Ohio (additional).....	1.00
Elgin Branch of Local Kane County Socialist Party of Illinois...	10.00
L. E. Seney, British Columbia.....	1.00
Joseph Weiss, New York.....	3.00
P. R. Skinner, Oregon (additional).....	15.00
F. R. Barrett, Maine.....	2.00
A. Schablik, Washington (additional).....	2.00
C., Illinois.....	1.00
F. M. Landis, Kansas.....	2.50
Local Dayton Socialist Party, Ohio.....	2.00
W. A. Cole, Texas.....	.50
J. J. Hamilton, Iowa.....	20.00
H. H. Lang, Oregon.....	12.00
J. W. Judah, Minnesota.....	1.00
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois (additional).....	134.85
Total	\$2,618.08

It is of the utmost importance that the remaining debt to non-stockholders be wiped out at once, and that the debt on which six per cent is paid be either entirely liquidated or refunded at a lower interest rate. Several stockholders have lent various sums of money at five per cent, and the company could use about two thousand dollars to advantage at this rate for a year or two, after which time it is hoped and believed that the voluntary contributions and sales of stock will relieve us of the necessity of paying interest at all.

Satisfactory evidence as to the sound condition of the company will be given to any one considering the question of making a five per cent loan, and additional security will be given if desired.

Meanwhile every one interested in the work of the company is urged to help make up the fund for paying off the floating debt, under the offer which expires Dec. 31. Understand that this is not making up a "deficit." There is no deficit. The company is not running behind, but is paying expenses. It has however, from the start been running without sufficient capital, and consequently has had to run in debt to publish the books that were needed. This contribution is being made to supply the needed capital, and to stop the yearly outlay for interest, so that all money received in future can be used to increase the output of socialist literature. The contributions thus far made have come not so much from those best able to help as from those most willing to do more than their share. Is your name in the list of acknowledgments? If not, may we not put it there in the January issue of the REVIEW?